

post-office building at Mandan, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 11255) to terminate certain special privileges and advantages heretofore conferred by Congress and not disturb any existing right in money or property, but in the future to favor the United States Government, for the benefit of all the people equitably, to the same extent that Congress has by law in the past favored the members of the Money Trust exclusively; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: Resolution (H. Res. 360) to ascertain the rate of duty to be imposed upon Cuban sugar imported after March 1, 1914; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWDLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 183) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to investigate the condition of trade in China for the purpose of determining the desirability of establishing there a permanent exposition of the products of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to suspend the provision exempting coastwise vessels from payment of tolls in the Panama Canal act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 11256) granting relief and an honorable discharge to Jacob Barger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 11257) to compensate the Taylor Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 11258) granting an increase of pension to Mollie E. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 11259) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Wiley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11260) granting an increase of pension to James C. Hudson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'HAIR: A bill (H. R. 11261) granting a pension to William W. Mullenix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 11262) granting an increase of pension to John H. Koenig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 11263) granting an increase of pension to William D. Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 11264) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Delaney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11265) granting a pension to John Delaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 11266) for the relief of the dependent widow of Charles Conklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 11267) granting a pension to Eliza J. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 11268) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: Petitions of Fred Marlatt, F. H. Oswald, and 150 other citizens of Atchison County, Mo., favoring the passage of House bill 10080, known as the Lindquist bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTON: Memorial of the Chicago Association of Commerce, in reference to the reclassifying of salaries of assistant postmasters and employees, the clerical grade of which is first and second classification; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of Capt. R. J. Barrett, of Hoboken, N. J., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the Manufacturers and Business Men's Association of New York, relative to the income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Randall Highlands Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, protesting against the removal of fire company; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the New Jersey Bankers' Association, relative to the currency bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Washington Board of Trade, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Retail Merchants' Association, protesting against any change in the half-and-half principle of the act of 1878; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of the directors of the Washington Board of Trade, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Retail Merchants' Association, protesting against any change in the half-and-half principle of the act of 1878; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of sundry citizens of Frederick County, Md., favoring the passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDQUIST (by request): Petition of citizens of the ninth district of the State of Missouri, favoring the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of sundry citizens of the first congressional district of the State of Missouri, favoring the passage of House bill 10080, to prohibit the misbranding of articles made from fabric, leather, rubber, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: Petition of business men of Aberdeen, Westminster, Havre de Grace, New Windsor, and Cockeysville, all in the State of Maryland, favoring the passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against the segregation of colored clerks in the departments at Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the Hornell Chamber of Commerce, of Hornell, N. Y., favoring the application of the railroads for a reasonable increase in freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS. Petitions of sundry citizens of Alger, Ada, and McGuffey, State of Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 3508, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Belle Center and Findlay, Ohio, favoring the passage of a bill prohibiting the misbranding of articles made from fabric, leather, or rubber; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

Monday, January 12, 1914.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee presenting ourselves as the objects of Thy tender mercy and of Thy constant care, made as we believe to receive revelations of Thyself, and with our highest function to give back into the heart of God self-revelations in response to all the expressions of Thy love for us. Thou hast saved us with an everlasting salvation, and Thou dost permit us to place our soul and body upon Thine altar as a living sacrifice in expression of our sense of infinite gratitude to Thee.

Thou hast brought us to the beginning of a new year. Thou dost call us forth into the untrodden paths of the days and months before us. We desire to have our life adjusted to God, to have our lives God-centered, that there may be light along the pathway at every step that we take, in the sacred trust which Thou hast committed to us not only for our personal life but for this great Nation.

So may we be obedient to the will of God and keep in step with God's forward movement, that we may work out Thy divine program for us as a people. Let Thy blessings rest upon every Senator in this honorable body. Give them Thy personal comfort and guidance and blessing, and lead them in the discharge of their public duty according to Thine own gracious will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 23, 1913, was read and approved.

THE COMMERCE COURT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter from the presiding judge of the United States Commerce Court calling

attention to a typographical error in a statement of expenditures of the appropriations for the maintenance of the United States Commerce Court previously transmitted, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WIND RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION (H. DOC. NO. 516).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of reports received by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs from the superintendent of the Shoshone Indian School and the assistant engineer of the Shoshone irrigation project in Wyoming relative to the construction of roads and bridges on the Wind River Indian Reservation, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

TRAVEL OF EMPLOYEES OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS (H. DOC. NO. 574).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of all expenses of attendance of officers or employees of the Library of Congress at meetings or conventions that have been incurred from June 30, 1913, to December 1, 1913, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

TRAVEL OF EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (H. DOC. NO. 575).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report from the auditor of the District of Columbia showing expenses incurred and paid by the District of Columbia for certain of its employees in attending meetings of associations or conventions under authority of the commissioners from June 30 to December 1, 1913, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed by the court in the following causes:

The cause of Mary L. Singleton, widow of William Singleton, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 348);

The cause of Lorenzo D. Jameson *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 347);

The cause of Sarah J. Whitson, widow of Ira K. Whitson, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 346);

The cause of Sarah E. Watson et al., heirs of Joseph E. Murphy, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 345);

The cause of John R. Porter *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 353);

The cause of Isabelle E. Bacon, one of the heirs of William R. Marsh, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 343);

The cause of Joseph Benton McCue, son and sole heir of William B. McCue, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 344);

The cause of Anna Voshell, widow (remarried) of Philemon Green, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 350);

The cause of Carrie G. Legg and Fred J. Graves, children and sole heirs of Judson H. Graves, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 349);

The cause of Therese Criswell, widow of Hanson Criswell, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 338);

The cause of Josephine M. Hensel, sister, and Charles B. Martin, brother, of Edwin B. Martin, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 340);

The cause of William H. White *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 352);

The cause of Alice Waggoner Burns, Rosa Waggoner Eccleston, George W. Waggoner, and Rena M. Waggoner, grandchildren and sole heirs of Hartwell L. Turner, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 341);

The cause of St. James Protestant Episcopal Church, of Culpeper County, Va., *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 339);

The cause of J. H. Maratta, administrator of the estate of Caleb Maratta, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 357);

The cause of Ambrose D. Vallandigham *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 351);

The cause of Hosen E. West, Sarah Parnell, Simeon J. West, and Mary Hensley, heirs of H. West, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 342);

The cause of the trustees of the Christian Church of Crab Orchard, Ky., *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 356);

The cause of Marion C. Thompson *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 354); and

The cause of the trustees of Porter Female Academy, of Williamson County, Tenn., *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 355).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the following causes:

The vessel sloop *Eliza*, Reuben McFarlane, master (H. Doc. No. 551);

The vessel ship *Jefferson*, William Freeman, master (H. Doc. No. 554);

The vessel schooner *Bellona*, Samuel Thomson, master (H. Doc. No. 546);

The vessel schooner *John*, Asher Cooke, master (H. Doc. No. 545);

The vessel ship *Pigou*, James Sinclair, master (H. Doc. No. 553);

The vessel schooner *Gideon*, Benjamin Lunt, master (H. Doc. No. 544);

The vessel brig *Jay*, Atkins, master (H. Doc. No. 529);

The vessel brig *Sally*, Paul Simpson, master (H. Doc. No. 528);

The vessel schooner *Mercury*, James Stone, master (H. Doc. No. 543);

The vessel schooner *Richmond*, Solomon Steed, master (H. Doc. No. 542);

The vessel brig *Esperanza*, David Travers, master (H. Doc. No. 527);

The vessel ship *Joseph*, Henry W. Bool, master (H. Doc. No. 550);

The vessel schooner *Benevolence*, John Ring, master (H. Doc. No. 541);

The vessel ship *Diana*, William Clark, master (H. Doc. No. 549);

The vessel schooner *Two Friends*, William Van Rensselaer, master (H. Doc. No. 540);

The vessel schooner *Adventure*, John Compton, master (H. Doc. No. 539);

The vessel schooner *Atlantic*, Joshua Bointon, master (H. Doc. No. 538);

The vessel schooner *Lark*, Robert Geiver, master (H. Doc. No. 537);

The vessel sloop *Eliza*, Thomas Payne, master (H. Doc. No. 558);

The vessel brig *Recovery*, Isaac Isaacs, master (H. Doc. No. 526);

The vessel brig *Pearl*, Thomas Horton, master (H. Doc. No. 525);

The vessel schooner *Molly Farlie*, Thomas Williams, master (H. Doc. No. 536);

The vessel brig *Hiram*, Grindal Gardner, master (H. Doc. No. 524);

The vessel schooner *Patriot*, Abner Hammett, master (H. Doc. No. 535);

The vessel sloop *Panger*, Isaac Judson, master (H. Doc. No. 557);

The vessel brig *Industry*, Benjamin Bowland, master (H. Doc. No. 523);

The vessel brig *Luna*, William Milbery, master (H. Doc. No. 522);

The vessel schooner *Industry*, John Waite, master (H. Doc. No. 534);

The vessel ship *Commerce*, Tobias Ham, master (H. Doc. No. 548);

The vessel schooner *Delight*, Orlando Dana, master (H. Doc. No. 533);

The vessel ship *Ann and Mary*, Thomas Hunt, master (H. Doc. No. 552);

The vessel schooner *Three Friends*, Joseph Rutherford, master (H. Doc. No. 532);

The vessel brig *Iris*, Farrand Clark, master (H. Doc. No. 521);

The vessel sloop *Catharine*, Hugh Peterson, master (H. Doc. No. 555);

The vessel sloop *Rising Sun*, Jesse Betts, master (H. Doc. No. 556);

The vessel ship *Polly*, Adam Pervis, master (H. Doc. No. 547); and

The vessel schooner *Chance*, Ichabod Goodrich, master (H. Doc. No. 531).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

VESSEL BRIG "RENSALAER" (H. DOC. NO. 530).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law and opinion filed by the court under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings and opinion by the court relating to the vessel brig *Rensalaer*, James Mitchell, master, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8142) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, at or near Wilmot, Ark., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the State Administrators of Vocational Education in conference in New York City, December 13, 1913, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the President to appoint a commission to consider the need and report a plan for national aid to vocational education, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of the Central Labor Union of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Branch 3, Socialist Body, Twenty-second Assembly District, of Kings County, N. Y.; of the Saugus Socialist Club, of Massachusetts; and of Vorhees Township, Branch No. 1, Socialist Party, of Gibbsboro, N. J.; and of the Socialist Party of Bay County, Mich., praying that an investigation be made into the conditions existing in the Michigan copper country, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of Andrew Jackson Branch, American Continental League, of Cincinnati, Ohio; of Local Branch, American Continental League, of Rochester, N. Y.; of Matthew Thornton Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Jefferson Branch, American Continental League, of New Bedford, Mass.; of the Robert Emmet Literary Society, of Wilmerding, Pa.; of Washington Branch, American Continental League of Youngstown, Ohio; of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Pittsfield, Mass.; of Andrew Jackson Branch, American Continental League, of Wilmerding, Pa.; of the Jefferson Club of the Seventeenth Ward, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; of the Affiliated Branches of the American Continental League, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; of Abraham Lincoln Branch, American Continental League, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; of Commodore Perry Branch, American Continental League, of Jersey City, N. J.; of the United Irish American Societies of Greater New York; and of Thomas Jefferson Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the celebration of the so-called 100 years of peace among English-speaking peoples, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the National Convention of Insurance Commissioners, held at New York, N. Y., December 16, 1913, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the testing and improvement of fire-retarding devices, which was referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief to persons who served in the United States Military Telegraph Corps during the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Farrell, Pa., remonstrating against the proposed dissolution of the United States Steel Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 1186, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to locate shipments of foodstuffs which have been held in cold storage, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Produce Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to locate shipments of foodstuffs which have been held in cold storage, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Order of Railway Conductors, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, assembled in joint union session at Freedom, Pa., praying for an investigation into the recent strike in the Calumet district, in Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of the Robert Emmet Literary Society, of Wilmerding; of the Andrew Jackson Branch, American Continental League, of Wilmerding; of the Thomas Jefferson Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; of the Matthew Thornton Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia; and of the affiliated branches of the American Continental League of Pittsburgh, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the celebration of the so-called one hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Daughters of Liberty of Quincy, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Berlin, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to employ additional architectural aid in the construction of the public buildings of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. WARREN], who is necessarily absent, I present a memorial of sundry citizens of Wyoming, protesting against the passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill, which I move be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (for Mr. WARREN) presented resolutions adopted by Local Union No. 905, of Reliance; of Local Union No. 2174, of Rock Springs; and of Local Union No. 2312, United Mine Workers of America, of Dietz, all in the State of Wyoming, favoring the appointment of a committee to make Federal investigation of the conditions in the copper-mining regions of the State of Michigan, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. WARREN) presented resolutions adopted by Local Union No. 2293, district 22, United Mine Workers of America, of Rock Springs, Wyo., and of Local Union No. 2700, United Mine Workers of America, of Crosby, Wyo., favoring the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employers and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hastings, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Crawford, and Scotch View, all in the State of Nebraska, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observation of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented petitions of the mayor and common council and of the Board of Trade of Sea Bright, N. J., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a retaining wall or bulkhead to protect the shore front at that place, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JACKSON. I present a resolution adopted by the Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church in annual session at Hackettstown, N. J., which I ask may be read.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

HACKETTSTOWN, N. J., January 8, 1914.

The Educational Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church in annual session, representing about 70 universities, colleges, and higher schools in every part of the United States, respectfully request the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled to include the provisions of the amendment to

Senate bill No. 3091, as offered by Senator JACKSON, of Maryland, on December 13, 1913, thus guaranteeing an equitable division of the funds appropriated in the bill as between the races.

Resolved further, That we commend the stand of Senator JACKSON in this particular.

J. R. HARKER,
President of the Association,
President of Woman's College, Jacksonville, Ill.
C. A. FULMER,
Secretary, Chancellor of Nebraska Wesleyan
University, Lincoln, Nebr.

Mr. BURTON presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Dover, Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed dissolution and destruction of the United States Steel Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the board of directors of the Business Men's Clubs of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the legalization of trade unions and prohibiting injunctions in certain cases, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Ohio Valley Druggists' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation recognizing and establishing the system of uniform prices on trademarked and branded goods, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Marion, Ohio, praying that the application of the railroads be granted for such reasonable increase of freight rates as may be necessary to cover the increased cost of operation brought about by the numerous demands made upon them, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Van Wert, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation annulling the civil-service status of assistant postmasters, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of the City Council of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the telegraph and telephone companies to be owned by the Government, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Pennington County, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Minneapolis Association of Credit Men, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of levees along the Mississippi River for the protection from flood waters, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Eden Prairie Presbyterian Church, of the Woman's Missionary Society of the First Presbyterian Church of Minneapolis, of the congregations of the Presbyterian Church of Bloomington, of the First Presbyterian Church of Minneapolis, of the Presbyterian congregations of Crystal Bay, Long Lake, and Maple Plain, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the so-called antipolygamy bill, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present resolutions adopted by the Seattle Rotary Club, of the State of Washington, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution from Seattle Rotary Club.

Whereas Alaska is conceded to be a land of great but undeveloped resources; and

Whereas first among these resources are vast fields of coal—anthracite, semibituminous, and bituminous—as good as any coal in the world and suitable for the use of the battleship fleet of the Navy of the United States; and

Whereas the coal now used by the Pacific Fleet is brought from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast around Cape Horn in foreign ships and at great expense; and

Whereas the opening of the Panama Canal and the coming expansion of the commerce of the United States on the Pacific Ocean and the more extended operations of the Navy on the waters of the Pacific Ocean will necessitate the assembling of vast quantities of coal for use not only in time of peace but as supply in preparation for possible war; and

Whereas these fields are now owned by all the people and are now being opened up by the Department of Mines for the use of the Navy; and

Whereas because of these facts the people of the Pacific coast are unanimous in agreeing that the first great necessity in the opening up and development of Alaska—the one thing which would be of the greatest material benefit not only to the people of Alaska and the Pacific coast but to the people of the whole country is the building and operation of a railroad to her great coal fields in order that the coal from the same may be made available for the battleships of our country as well as the commerce of the world; and that the second great

necessity is the continuation of such a railroad connecting one of her open ports with her great interior river systems and thus by adequate transportation provide the foundation upon which to develop her vast dormant mineral and agricultural possibilities for the benefit of the whole country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Rotary Club of the city of Seattle does hereby endorse the plan of railroad construction in Alaska in general as embraced in the bills on this subject in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States which have already been recommended for passage, having received the approval of the Committee on Territories in both the House and Senate, respectively, believing the plan so authorized to be such as all broad-minded men interested in the development of this country can approve.

Epitomized these bills authorize the appropriation of \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000 for the building of railroads in Alaska under and by direction of the President of the United States. All details as to carrying out the same and the selection of routes, etc., are left to the President. The Interstate Commerce Commission is given authority over the roads when constructed. The appropriation for construction is to be repaid by a proportion of all moneys derived from the sale of public lands or from the coal or mineral therein contained or the timber thereon; be it further

Resolved, That the rotary clubs of the United States be requested to take such favorable action in regard to the purpose of these resolutions as may be deemed advisable and to make such action known to all of the Members of Congress from their respective States.

WM. T. PERKINS,
Chairman,
C. G. HEIFNER,
E. G. SHORROCK,
O. L. CHAPMAN,
Committee.
CLAUDE H. ECKART,
President.
W. A. GRAHAM, Jr.,
Secretary.

ALASKA.

(From Seattle Rotary Club.)

The United States purchased Alaska from Russia in 1867, paying therefor \$7,200,000. Since that time the Government has expended approximately \$40,000,000 in administering a so-called government there and in the building of roads, aids to navigation, etc., making a total expenditure for Alaska, including its purchase price, of approximately \$50,000,000. Due to the fortitude and courage of American pioneers, we have taken from the land and waters of Alaska products valued at approximately \$500,000,000, leaving a balance in favor of Alaska of about \$450,000,000. It has proved a profitable business transaction.

The Government of the United States has sent trained experts to Alaska, who have made exhaustive reports on the vast undeveloped resources of that Territory. It is known that the greatest fisheries of the world to-day are in Alaskan waters; it is known that both anthracite and bituminous coal exists there in quantity and quality equal to the great coal fields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Representatives of the Agricultural Department have grown wheat of the finest quality at the junction of the Tanana and Yukon Rivers, producing 50 to 60 bushels an acre. Agricultural experts have estimated that there are 64,000,000 acres of farming and grazing lands in Alaska, with a soil more productive and a climate more salubrious than may be found in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, or Finland, which countries are in practically the same latitude. These countries do not contain more than one-half the same agricultural and grazing area that is found in Alaska, and yet they maintain a population of twelve to fifteen million people.

About 12 years ago the Government purchased and sent to Alaska 1,200 reindeer. These have increased in number until we now have about 40,000 head. It is estimated that the great area north of the Yukon River will maintain 10,000,000 reindeer with scarcely a dollar of expense on the part of the United States. These reindeer will live on the moss that grows profusely in that country, become fat and sleek, and by proper and judicious business methods can be made to supply a large amount of the meat needed by the people of the United States.

These few references only give a hint of the unlimited possibilities of Alaskan resources when properly developed.

But these great resources are of little use without proper transportation facilities. There is no doubt but that individual capital and enterprise would develop these resources, providing the interests furnishing the capital could monopolize Alaska's great resources. But it is evident that the people of the United States have determined not to permit the monopolization of the resources of that great Territory which nature intended for all the people of the United States. As a result, no effort is being put forth at the present time by private enterprise to build railroads and furnish the necessary transportation facilities to encourage development. Men who have invested their money there, others who have given this matter profound consideration and who have the best interests of the people of Alaska as well as of the United States at heart, and who have no pecuniary interests to subserve, have reached the conclusion that if we are to have transportation facilities in that great Territory so as to encourage development and insure equitable and fair freight and passenger rates that the Government of the United States must be depended upon to build the necessary railroads from tidewater to the coal fields and the great river basins in the interior.

Bills authorizing the President to construct such railway lines and appropriating \$40,000,000 therefor were introduced in both Houses of Congress in April, 1913. Hearings were had before the Territorial Committees of both Houses, and reports favorable to the passage of these bills came from both committees. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior have both given their warm approval to these bills. They are on the calendars of both Houses, to be taken up for early consideration at the next regular session of Congress in December. We hope that the rotary clubs of the United States will lend us their influence and support and will urge their Representatives in Congress to favor the early passage of these bills. We believe the expenditure of \$40,000,000 in the construction of railway transportation lines in Alaska will add a billion dollars to our national wealth and bring into use these great resources that now lie untouched and in many instances are going to waste. We ask your support in behalf of the Government railroad bills now pending in Congress, believing that the early passage of these bills will result in the early development of Alaska's wonderful resources and thereby augment the commercial and industrial growth of all the people of the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Cordova, Alaska, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORDOVA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Cordova, Alaska.

Whereas the unfortunate conditions which have existed in the Territory of Alaska during the past few years make it imperative that Government aid should be extended in the construction of railroads within the Territory, which would prove a stimulus to the development of the rich resources of the country;

And whereas a measure generally known as the Chamberlain-Wickersham bill, which provides for the expenditure of \$35,000,000 or \$40,000,000 for the purposes of railroad construction in Alaska has been favorably reported in the United States Senate and agreed to by the House Committee on Territories;

And whereas most of the Representatives in Congress from the Western States, as well as the commercial bodies of the Pacific coast, have given a willing, earnest, and vigorous support to the measure providing for railroad construction in Alaska: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cordova Chamber of Commerce cordially indorses the bill referred to as being the most practicable means as an aid to the development of the Territory, and commends in grateful appreciation the efforts that have been put forth in support of this measure by the Representatives in Congress and the commercial bodies of Seattle and other cities; and be it further

Resolved, That the western Members of Congress be earnestly requested and urged to put forth every possible effort to secure the passage of the Chamberlain-Wickersham bill during the early days of the new session to begin on December 1, as the needs of Alaska are imperative and present conditions deplorable.

H. A. SLATER, *President*,
NATHANIEL GREENE, *Secretary*.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief to persons who served in the United States Military Telegraph Corps during the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of the Socialist Club of Saugus, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against the adoption of certain provisions of the income-tax law, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Pittsfield, Mass., and a memorial of Jefferson Branch, American Continental League, of New Bedford, Mass., remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the so-called celebration of "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Local Union No. 229, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, of Boston, and of the Central Labor Union of Springfield, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for an investigation into the mining conditions of the copper districts in Michigan, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Association of Sealers of Weights and Measures, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for uniformity of weights and measures throughout the various States, which was referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

He also presented resolutions of the national legislation committee of the Board of Trade of Springfield and of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of the so-called Lever agricultural extension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the board of directors of Boston Credit Men's Association, favoring the enactment of legislation for the prevention of floods throughout the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employers and laborers, and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Athol, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of General George A. Custer Council, No. 22, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Oakland, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of Crescent City, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction and maintenance of a breakwater at that place, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a breakwater and for the improvement of the harbor at Crescent City, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, praying for the reorganization of the United States Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the California Branch of the American School Peace League, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the suspension for one year of the naval construction program, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. ROOT presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of sundry citizens of Holly, Battle Creek, Union City, Lansing, and Flint, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of Rena L. Miner, president of the Michigan Department of Army Nurses of the Civil War, praying for the passage of the so-called Army nurse pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NORRIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hastings, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Daughters of Liberty of Ansonia, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Federation of Women's Clubs of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing Federal control of the water powers on the public domain, which was referred to the Committee on the Conservation of Natural Resources.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of the Minnesota Historical Society, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a monument to the memory of Lieut. William S. Cox, United States Navy, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented petitions of the Commercial Clubs of Thief River Falls, Roseau, Warroad, Roosevelt, International Falls, Spooner, and Baudette, all in the State of Minnesota, praying that an appropriation be made to aid in improvements, fire protection, and drainage of unentered Chippewa lands on the ceded Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. LODGE presented the memorial of William E. Bliss, C. E. Palmer, and 86 other citizens of Massachusetts remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Rural Letter Carriers' Association of Massachusetts, favoring an increase and the readjustment of the salaries of rural letter carriers, and recommending certain changes in that service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Pittsfield, and of Jefferson Branch, American Continental League, of New Bedford, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the celebration of 100 years of peace with England, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Massachusetts Association of Sealers of Weights and Measures, praying for the enact-

ment of legislation regulating weights and measures throughout the country, which was referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

He also presented a petition of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union of Boston, Mass., praying for an investigation of the mining conditions in Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a memorial of Liberty Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Yakima County, Wash., remonstrating against raising the embargo on potatoes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Spokane County Rural Letter Carriers' Association of Washington, favoring the enactment of legislation increasing the salaries of rural letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Council of North Yakima, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called Alaska railroad bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Spokane Camp, No. 2, Sons of Veterans, of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an increase in the military and naval forces of the United States and for the preparation of boys in the high schools of the country for such purpose, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3875) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain department publications and to provide for crediting the department's printing allotment with the proceeds; to the Committee on Printing.

A bill (S. 3876) to amend section 2322 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mineral locations;

A bill (S. 3877) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to rights of way through certain parks, reservations, and other public lands," approved February 15, 1901;

A bill (S. 3878) to validate certain homestead entries; and

A bill (S. 3879) to provide for a permanent supply of coal for the use of the United States Navy and other governmental purposes, to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3880) to authorize agricultural entries on surplus coal lands in Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3881) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining, and to regulate the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 3882) pensioning the surviving officers and enlisted men of the Utah volunteers employed in the defense of the frontier settlements of the Territory of Utah against Indian depredations during the years from 1865 to 1868, inclusive, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3883) granting an increase of pension to Edmund T. Hulaniski (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3884) granting an increase of pension to William G. Brown (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3885) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Ann Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 3886) to repeal sections 2588, 2589, and 2590 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 3887) granting a pension to George W. Williams (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3888) for the construction of a dry dock on the Columbia River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3889) to regulate homestead entries in cases where persons otherwise entitled as heirs or devisees of a deceased applicant are disqualified by reason of alienage; and

A bill (S. 3890) providing for second homestead and desert-land entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3891) to increase the limit of cost for the erection and completion of the United States building at Pendleton, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3892) for the relief of Charles G. Griffa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3893) for the relief of George N. Wolfe (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3894) for the relief of William Fulton Hedges (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 3895) to prevent the use of the mails and of the telegraph and telephone in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what committee does the Senator from Oklahoma wish to have the bill referred?

Mr. OWEN. The Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. OLIVER. Ought it not to go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been in the habit of complying with the request of the Senator who introduces a bill. In the opinion of the Chair, the bill should go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, but it will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, if that is the request of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. That is my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 3896) granting a pension to Mary E. High (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3897) authorizing the Great Northern Railway Co. to revise its line of railway adjacent to the Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and granting to the said railway company the right of way for its revised line in the said national Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3898) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquiring of rights of way by railroad companies through Indian reservations, Indian lands, and Indian allotments, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1899; and

A bill (S. 3899) to provide for the acquiring of additional lands by railroad companies through Indian reservations, Indian lands, and Indian allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3900) granting an increase of pension to Malachi Cordero; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 3901) granting a pension to Thomas F. Keating;

A bill (S. 3902) granting a pension to James Hanna;

A bill (S. 3903) granting a pension to William R. Claxton;

A bill (S. 3904) granting an increase of pension to Richard De Groat;

A bill (S. 3905) granting a pension to Perdita McVean;

A bill (S. 3906) granting a pension to Alexander M. Robertson;

A bill (S. 3907) granting an increase of pension to James B. Romaine; and

A bill (S. 3908) granting an increase of pension to William H. Van Name; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3909) for the relief of the heirs at law of Peter Nodine; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3910) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso Maddocks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3911) for the relief of the estate of David B. Landis, deceased, and the estate of Jacob F. Sheaffer, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 3912) granting an increase of pension to David Keith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3913) granting an increase of pension to Marie L. Van Solen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3914) granting an increase of pension to John Leary (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3915) granting a pension to Catherine Holbrook (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 3916) authorizing the Treasury Department to test upon ships a device or devices for hoisting and lowering life-boats at sea; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3917) granting a pension to Evelina Sprague;

A bill (S. 3918) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Chatfield (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3919) granting an increase of pension to John Bowman (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3920) granting an increase of pension to Wilton G. Lewis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 3921) for the relief of Fred B. Balano; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEEKS (for Mr. SHERMAN):

A bill (S. 3922) to provide for the election by the qualified electors of the several political parties in the congressional districts and States of delegates, alternates, and national committeemen for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and to regulate the respective national conventions; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 3923) to provide for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3924) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Elisha L. Bennett, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3925) for the relief of Teresa Girolami (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3926) relating to the adjudication of homestead entries in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3927) authorizing the appointment of Joseph Westesson, a professor of mathematics, with the rank of lieutenant, in the United States Navy, on the retired list; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3928) granting a pension to Isabel Arneson; and

A bill (S. 3929) granting an increase of pension to Harriett M. G. Crooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 3930) to provide for investigation to ascertain the feasibility of the construction of a dam and irrigating ditches in the San Pedro Valley, State of Arizona; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3931) providing for increasing the water supply of the city of Washington, for the building of a dam on the Potomac River to supply light and power for the use of the United States and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 3932) to authorize the establishment of a light and fog-signal station at Point Vicente, Cal.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3933) providing for the payment of certain claims of the State of California growing out of the Indian wars; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3934) for the relief of W. A. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3935) granting a pension to Fred T. Macomber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3936) to prohibit improper and corrupt lobbying and to regulate the employment of legislative counsel and agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3937) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hubbell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3938) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Puffer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3939) authorizing the issuance of patent to the heirs of James Longmire; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3940) granting a pension to John Simonsen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 3941) for the relief of Omer D. Lewis; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3942) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 3943) granting a pension to Ida Gilhooly (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 3944) granting an increase of pension to William H. Goodwin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3945) granting an increase of pension to George Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 3946) granting an increase of pension to Frank Kesler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3947) granting an increase of pension to John Lynn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3948) granting an increase of pension to Benton Braden (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3949) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Stall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3950) providing for the registration of designs for manufactured products; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3951) authorizing and legalizing the exchange of certain lands between the United States and the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 3952) granting an increase of pension to Simon B. Rothchild (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3953) granting an increase of pension to John C. Miller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3954) granting a pension to Eliza Clark (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3955) granting an increase of pension to Burden H. Barrett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (by request):

A bill (S. 3956) authorizing the purchase of lands chiefly valuable for timber and for the growth of timber in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) providing for method of improving channels giving access to military reservations or fortifications (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

ROCK CREEK PARK.

Mr. LODGE. I submit an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for the removal of dead and down timber from the woods and streams of Rock Creek Park, in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by me to the District of Columbia appropriation bill. I ask that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I should be glad if the committee would give me an opportunity to be heard upon the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and printed.

LANDS IN OREGON.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3343) granting to the State of Oregon certain lands claimed by the State of Oregon under an act of Congress approved September 28, 1850, and an act of Congress approved March 12, 1860, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment relative to an appropriation for the completion of the improvement at the mouth of the Columbia River, Oreg., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the examination and survey of the Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho, with a view to the canalization of these streams between Celilo and the mouth of the Columbia and to Pittsburg Landing on the Snake River, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$146,000 for continuing the improvement and completion of the north jetty of the Stuslaw River, Oreg., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

HARBOR OF HAMBURG AND THE LOWER ELBE.

Mr. LANE. I present a paper, being a reply to instructions of the Department of State adopted October 4, 1913, relative to the harbor of Hamburg and the lower Elbe. I move that the paper be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

HOOR OF DAILY MEETING.

On motion of Mr. KEEN, it was

Ordered, That the hour of the daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.

Mr. LANE. I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read. The resolution (S. Res. 241) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed to conduct an examination and inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether there exist facts or evidence that in the opinion of the commission would justify the Government in instituting suits or legal proceedings for recovery of fines, penalties, or forfeitures from the United States Steel Corporation, its subsidiaries, or any common carrier because of unlawful rebates, offsets, and preferences received and accepted by the above-named corporation or its constituent companies within the last six years.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed to hear all witnesses and testimony in pursuance of this resolution at open public hearings to be held before one or more members of the commission.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby further directed to forthwith subpoena and bring before it William H. Green, of Creighton, Neb., to give testimony before said commission relative to unlawful rebates, offsets, or preferences received and accepted by the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiary corporations from common carriers as aforesaid.

And should said William H. Green when before the commission name any other person or persons as having knowledge of facts or evidence showing payments of unlawful rebates, offsets, or preferences to said United States Steel Corporation or subsidiary thereof as aforesaid, then the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed to forthwith subpoena and examine before it any such person or persons: Provided, That nothing in this resolution shall be construed as affecting the discretion of the commission with respect to the taking of the testimony of any witness or causing such witness to produce books or papers when it appears that such witness is an employee, agent, officer, or director of the United States Steel Corporation, any subsidiary thereof, or of any common carrier.

The commission shall within 30 days after it has completed the taking of testimony and examination of witnesses report to the Senate full particulars of all material facts and evidence as revealed by the inquiry herein provided for, together with the opinion of the commission thereon.

Mr. LANE. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution go over and be printed, Mr. President.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think the resolution ought to be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The Interstate Commerce Commission, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] knows, is already overburdened with work, and I think that a proposition for such an inquiry as this ought to go before the Committee on Interstate Commerce in order that it may look into it and determine whether the matter involved is of sufficient importance to require the commission to investigate it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I wish to say, for the information of the Senator from Iowa, that allegations are made in the resolution that such methods are being pursued in carrying on the business of the United States Steel Corporation, and I think it is a most excellent time right now to enter into an inquiry concerning it. I shall ask for the consideration of the matter at the hands of this body. I do not wish it tucked away in the Committee on Interstate Commerce in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission time to clear up their work. That will take 8 or 10 years, as nearly as I can ascertain, if they keep up their present rate of progress; at any rate, it will require not less than three or four years, which would be too long a delay.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being objection to the present consideration, it will lie over until to-morrow.

Mr. LANE. I will call up the matter to-morrow.

CONDITIONS IN MINING DISTRICTS IN MICHIGAN.

Mr. ASHURST. I submit a resolution which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 243), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Education and Labor is hereby directed to make a thorough and complete investigation of the conditions existing in the copper mines in the Calumet, Hancock, and South Range copper mining districts in the counties of Houghton, Keweenaw, and Ontonagon, Mich., for the purpose of ascertaining—

First. Full and accurate facts concerning the past history and present status of the relations of the employers and employees in the said copper mines in so far as the said history may have any direct or indirect relation to the existing labor troubles, and to this purpose and end said committee is authorized and directed to investigate and report as to the justice and reasonableness of the minimum wage demand of the employees in said district, the justice and reasonableness of an increase in the compensation of the employees, the reasonableness of an eight-hour day for underground employees, and the necessity and reasonableness of the employment of two men on all machine drills.

Second. The history of the organization of the various companies or corporations owning or working copper mines in the said district; that is to say, the committee shall ascertain how much money was originally invested in the purchase and acquisition of the said copper

properties by the owners, the amount of the gross yield of the mines, and the value of the capital stock of the various corporations (operating copper mines) at the time of their incorporation and the market value of the capital stock of such corporations at the present time. The committee shall especially investigate the facts and report as to the amount of dividends and assessments of the said copper mines with the view especially of ascertaining the amount of the assessments levied by the Calumet & Hecla Mining Co. and the amount of money paid out as dividends by that company from its inception down to the present time.

Third. Whether or not any of the employers or employees in said district have declined to consent to a committee on arbitration to be appointed by the President of the United States and the governor of the State of Michigan, jointly, to which committee all matters in dispute might be submitted and by the findings of which committee all parties at interest should be bound.

Fourth. Whether or not any system of peonage is maintained in said copper-mining districts.

Fifth. Whether or not access to post offices is prevented; and if so, by whom.

Sixth. Whether or not the immigration laws of the United States are being or have been violated in the said copper-mining districts; and if so, by whom.

Seventh. Whether or not the Secretary of Labor or any other official or officials of the Government may be of service in the premises.

Eighth. Whether or not persons are being or have been convicted and punished in violation of the laws of the United States.

Ninth. Whether there exists or has existed a combination of copper-mining companies in restraint of interstate commerce and trade for the purpose of advancing the price at which copper shall be sold to consumers in Michigan and other States, or for any other purpose.

Tenth. Investigate and report whether or not firearms, ammunition, and explosives have been imported into said State for the use of either party to the existing labor troubles, and the number, names, and general reputation of the men imported into said district to act as guards, deputy sheriffs, or in similar positions.

Eleventh. Investigate the efforts of the various labor organizations to unionize said copper mines, including demands made on employers, and the methods used to enforce said demands.

Twelfth. Whether or not the said copper-mining companies have attempted to influence the action of officials, judicial or otherwise, in said district, or have interfered with the administration of justice in said district.

Thirteenth. If all or any of the above conditions exist, then to ascertain the causes leading up to such conditions.

Said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby empowered to sit and act during the session of Congress or of either House thereof at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers, books, and documents; to employ stenographers at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page; to take and make a record of all evidence taken and received by the committee and keep a record of its proceedings; to have such evidence, record, and other matter required by the committee printed. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness, by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the investigation herein authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The expenses of such investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am sorry that the exigencies of politics outside of Michigan seem to make it necessary to present such a resolution at this time. I would be the last Member of this body to try to prevent a settlement of the unfortunate condition that exists in our State, and which has existed there since July last; and I certainly would not object to any effort being put forth which would result in securing justice to the parties concerned.

If Michigan is suffering from one thing more than another at this time, it is that from outside influences. The governor of Michigan has been doing his very best to adjust the unfortunate conditions in the copper country. The Department of Labor has made an investigation; the Department of Justice has sent a representative up into that country, who has not yet reported; the governor himself has been on the ground for several days, and his report is not yet out; a grand jury has been called, composed of men who were selected before the strike occurred; and that grand jury is still at work, at least its findings have not been submitted; yet it is proposed at this time to secure the passage of a resolution calling for an investigation by the Congress through a committee composed of men, possibly, in some instances, at least, who have already prejudged the situation. This resolution proposes things which no Senator on this floor believes Congress can take constitutional cognizance of or has any legal right to investigate. There is contained in the resolution a voluntary insult to the courts of our State, it being suggested that they have been improperly influenced.

To my mind, Mr. President, this resolution was not intended for and will not result in settling the disturbance in upper Michigan. If we could have an investigation that would be

fair and just, of all matters which Congress has any right to investigate, I would gladly support it, because the public lacks the facts involved in this distressing controversy. I do not believe that an investigation by a committee of Congress will help us any. I repeat, the resolution covers matters with which Congress has no right to deal. There are some statements made in the resolution which, if correct, would be subject to investigation by Congress. If it should be confined to those matters, and it is thought by the committee after a careful investigation that justice is going to be secured, and that that unsettled condition can be settled, I want the investigation; but, Mr. President, until a report has been made by the authorities of the State, who have been honestly and properly investigating this matter, it seems to me that the Congress ought not to intervene.

I deny that there is a State in this Union which has a higher regard for justice and right or that exerts more care in looking after the relative interests of all parties in all controversies within its borders than Michigan.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I am sorry the exigencies of politics seem to make it necessary for outside influences to ask that something be done in Michigan. Unless it can be shown that there is some prospect of shedding some sunlight on this vexed question that will help us in Michigan and help the country to get at the exact truth of the situation Congress should not take this proposed action.

I ask, Mr. President, that the resolution be printed and go over, so that we can have a chance to look at it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution has been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. The question has not been put.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me that under the rule it is competent for any Senator to object to the present consideration of a resolution, so that it will go over until the following day and then any proper disposition can be made of it.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I did not ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution, and I trust no Senator misheard me. I never thought of asking for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

In reply to my friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan I am sorry he permitted himself to make what I deem to be the unjust observation that this resolution was prompted by political considerations or political expediency. The Senator from Michigan is a truthful man. He is a gentleman. If he has any evidence that this resolution has been prompted by political considerations or expediency now, in the Senate, is the time to produce his evidence or to admit that he was in error in saying such a thing.

I have very high regard for the Senator from Michigan, and he knows it. It misbecomes him to say that political considerations or political exigencies have prompted the introduction of this resolution.

Sir, I represent, in part, the State of Arizona. In that State we do not believe that the mere interests of Arizona are all that should engage our attention. While I have no right to speak for my colleague, I believe, in fact I know, he shares my view that to promote the good of the Nation should be as much the duty of a Senator as to put forward the good of his own State.

If political expediency prompted this resolution, then, Mr. President, I am at least glad that something prompted the Senate of the United States to try in a calm, orderly way to ascertain the truth. If it be "political expediency" to ascertain the truth, then the epithet should be worn by myself. I deny that there is aught in the resolution that is other than the most strict parliamentary language. I regret the necessity which prompted the resolution, and I deny again that it is prompted by other than the desire to promote the public weal.

I say to the Senator from Michigan that it ill becomes him to make and repeat, as he did, such an assertion.

Sir, I have received over 5,000 letters and telegrams on this subject from all parts of the United States, from statesmen, from writers, from business men, from lawyers, from laborers, from college men, from all classes of men all over the United States. I have this portfolio [exhibiting] full that I could put into the Record if I saw fit. I shall not do so, however. These communications urge me or somebody in a calm, sedate, and proper way to introduce a resolution asking an investigation of what we must admit is a deplorable situation in the State of Michigan. If the time unfortunately comes, as I trust it will not, when the same condition obtains in my own State, I shall be the first to ask for the light, the first to ask for the truth, and shall be the last to rise in my place and object to any committee of the Senate ascertaining the truth.

I shall not incorporate into the Record a long list of these letters and telegrams, but I shall read one telegram which I have just received from one of the most accurate, one of the most profound thinkers in the United States, Charles Edward Russell:

CHICAGO, ILL., January 11, 1914.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Have just returned from investigation of copper miners' strike in Michigan. Situation clearly demands investigation by Congress. Lawlessness and oppression of armed guards, misuse of militia, violation of constitutional rights, killing of peaceable citizens, deportation, interference with interstate business require it. Because I know your profound sympathy with toilers and services for people, beg you to press this.

CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL.

I care not, so far as I am personally concerned, by what epithet the Senator from Michigan may choose to stigmatize my poor and weak efforts to obtain the truth; but if he believes he can shut off an investigation by characterizing it with an epithet or saying that it was prompted by political expediency, he does not show the wisdom and the judgment he usually shows.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understood the request made by the Senator from Arizona was for reference. The question was on the reference of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been referred.

Mr. LODGE. It is my misfortune that I did not know it. I was waiting here to say a word with regard to it, and I was not conscious that it had been referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution calls for the expenditure of money, and under the statute the Chair had referred it to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I do not question the proper direction of the Chair as to the course it should take; but I think a resolution of that sort, under the rules, goes over for one day on the objection of any Senator. The Senator from Michigan was recognized as soon as the resolution was read, and asked that it go over and be printed. I was about to make the same request myself; for, as I listened to the reading of the resolution, which is a very long one, I gathered that there were in it some subjects undoubtedly within the jurisdiction of the Congress and others that, it seemed to me, clearly were not.

I do not think it is within our jurisdiction or is proper for us to enter upon an inquiry as to whether or not a State court has been bought up. It seems to me hardly proper for us to undertake to pass upon the question whether a State has acted within its rights in the exercise of its police power.

For those reasons, it seems to me, that before the resolution takes the course which the Chair has properly designated we should have a right to look at it and consider whether or not it should be referred in its present form.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said something about the State courts which I did not hear. Will he repeat his statement?

Mr. LODGE. I said there was a clause there which appeared to me, as I heard it read, to call for an investigation of the State courts to see whether or not they had been bought up.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished Senator could possibly put such a construction on the language. The resolution says nothing about anybody being "bought up" or "sold down." I am very sorry that impression has gotten out. It is absurd.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will read what I heard, and it seems to me to indicate that:

12. Whether or not the said copper-mining companies have attempted to influence the action of officials, judicial or otherwise, in said district, or have interfered with the administration of justice in said district.

If that does not mean improper interference with the State courts, I do not know what language does mean.

Mr. ASHURST. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that the resolution does not use the harsh characterization which the Senator attributes to it. It does not say that anybody has been "bought up" or "sold down." I know that when the Senator reflects he must see the injustice which is done by saying on the floor of the Senate that the resolution contains a suggestion that anybody has been "bought up."

Mr. LODGE. It is a proposition to investigate the State courts of Michigan and see whether or not they have been improperly influenced by anybody.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the state of the record, regardless of what Senators may say about it.

The Senator from Arizona requested that a resolution be read and referred to the proper committee. There was no objection. It was read. In view of the fact that it called for the expenditure of money, it has been referred to the Commit-

tee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. After that was done the point was made that the resolution, upon objection, should lie over one day under the rule. It came after the reference.

The view of the Chair is that it is first the duty of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to say whether or not money shall be expended for any purpose. When the resolution comes back from that committee, it seems to the Chair, that will be the time to determine whether this resolution or an amended resolution shall be passed, or whether it shall be referred to some committee to determine what, if any, resolution shall be passed.

The Chair does not care anything about it, but that is the state of the record.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I remember well hearing the Senator from Arizona state that he introduced the resolution and asked for its reference to the Committee on Education and Labor. I had no objection whatever to its going to that committee. The resolution had not been read. We knew nothing about what was in the resolution. Of course, after the reading of the resolution the question should be considered whether it should go to that committee or some other committee.

I think the Chair was perfectly right in having the resolution referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, provided no objection was made to it. Under the rules an objection carries it over for one day. To-morrow, when it comes up regularly and automatically at the close of the morning business, the Senate will decide as to whether or not it shall make an amendment to it.

It seems to me an amendment should be made to the resolution before it goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, because after it goes there the committee only has the question to consider whether or not it shall authorize the expenditure of the money. A part of the committee may want to authorize the expenditure of the money for a certain portion of the resolution, but may not like to order the money spent for the whole of it.

Therefore, in my opinion, the resolution ought to be perfected in the Senate before it goes to the committee. The proper way to proceed would be to have it done at the present time, if there were not an objection raised, but there was an objection, which took it over until to-morrow, when it will come up automatically before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to say that when a resolution upon a like subject was introduced, for the investigation of conditions in the West Virginia coal mines, the resolution was sent first to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and that committee struck out of it those parts of the resolution which, in the opinion of the committee, were not subjects matter of Federal jurisdiction, and then authorized the expenditure of the money for the other purposes. In other words, it reported the resolution back to the Senate with an amendment, which was adopted. Then a resolution came from the Committee on Education and Labor, which at that time I thought was the same resolution that had come to us and had been corrected by us; and in that resolution there were restored certain features of the original resolution which did not relate to the subjects matter of Federal jurisdiction.

I mention this merely because it shows the danger that lies along the pathway. As a matter of fact, the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate never did favor the expenditure of money for certain purposes in connection with that investigation, and yet the money was expended for those purposes.

I wish to give notice that in case this resolution goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, if we strike out of it such parts of it as we think are purely matters of State jurisdiction, and then if it comes back from any other committee to which it shall be subsequently referred—and it will have to be referred to some other committee, because we have no jurisdiction over anything except the expenditure of money—we shall oppose it.

I think, therefore, it would be better if the resolution went to some other committee first, and then were referred to this committee, after it comes back, for it to consider the question as to the expenditure of the money out of the contingent fund.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator I wish to say that it is my opinion that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has no right whatever to change a resolution when it is referred to the committee for the purpose of determining whether money shall be expended from the contingent fund of the Senate. The resolution ought to be perfected in the Senate before it goes to that

committee, and then the committee will have to pass upon the question whether they shall authorize the expenditure of money from the contingent fund of the Senate for the purpose of the investigation, if an investigation it may be.

Therefore it seems to me that the objection made here to-day carries the resolution over for one day. To-morrow, when it comes up automatically before the Senate, it should be perfected and then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know no rule of the Senate, nor do I know any principle, that prevents the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from amending a resolution which has been referred to it, just as any other committee does. When a resolution is referred there to expend certain moneys out of the contingent fund for a certain investigation, it seems to me it is clearly within the jurisdiction of the committee to determine that certain parts of the resolution do not present subjects of appropriate Federal investigation, and to strike those parts out of the resolution. At any rate, that is the course we took in the other case, whether we had the right to do it or not, and I think that is the course that will be taken by the committee in the future.

Clearly we might conclude that there was a right, for example, to see whether interstate commerce had been interfered with or whether the administration of postal affairs had been interfered with, and to order money to be expended from the contingent fund for the purpose of investigating to see whether or not that was the case, whereas we would have no right to investigate to see whether John Smith had lawlessly slain John Jones, and we would not appropriate money out of the contingent fund of the Senate to investigate that case of manslaughter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in this particular case the Senator introducing the resolution does not want consideration of it until it is referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Now, the Committee on Education and Labor wants to know, the Senate wants to know, whether the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate are willing to enter upon the investigation, and they have the resolution referred to them not under the rules of the Senate but under the law. The law requires that it shall go to that committee. If the committee decide that they want an investigation of this question they will report favorably to the Senate, and then the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor according to the request made by the introducer of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why can they not decide that they want the money expended for an investigation as to a part of the resolution which they deem a part of the business of the Senate and not as to other parts which they deem not to be parts of the business of the Senate?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I understand the status of the record, it is that the resolution has already been referred; that it was referred before objection was made.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It must have been referred before it was read, because I waited until the reading was through and got the recognition of the Chair immediately after the reading.

Mr. BORAH. My observation with reference to the West Virginia resolution is that it is not very material whether it proceeds first to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate or whether it proceeds second to that committee, because it will be fought out in both places. Even if it is perfected in the minds of the Committee on Education and Labor, it will be reperfected by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, especially while the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is the chairman of that committee, because he has certain views with reference to the question of State rights. So you have to meet the question, and I think it very immaterial whether it goes to that committee first or goes to it second.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not wish to make any point on the matter referred to by the Vice President. I desire to state, however, I had not supposed that when a Senator rose to present a resolution, stating in presenting it where he wished to have it referred, that such request estopped any Senator from asking, under Rule XIV, that the resolution be printed and go over for a day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair interrupt the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator from Michigan whether when he was on his feet the first time he objected to the resolution being referred to the committee,

or whether it was not after it had been referred that the Senator from Michigan rose?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I asked in the course of my first remarks that it go over and be printed. I had not heard the Chair announce that the resolution would be referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is the recollection of the Senator from Michigan that he asked that the resolution be printed and go over before the Chair referred it, the Chair having no pride of opinion, will withdraw the resolution from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and let it lie over until to-morrow. But that is not the recollection of the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the reading of the stenographer's notes where the Senator from Michigan objected.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that is conceded.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on that proposition further before I take my seat. I am confident that the Senator from Arizona presented this resolution, because he had been asked to present it. Of course, I believe he presented it because some people in Arizona asked him to present it, and that he thought, and honestly thought, it was his political duty to present the resolution.

Now, Mr. President, I am not claiming that there ought not to be an investigation of affairs in Michigan. I am not resisting any honest investigation of conditions in my State which are properly subject to investigation by Congress. Indeed, if I thought the truth of the strike situation could be obtained in no other way I would be even willing that the rights of Michigan might be invaded, for the exact truth is all-important. The trouble has continued so long because the real issue has been so confused and uncertain.

I have advocated since I have been a Member of Congress a measure providing for the investigation of such controversies. There is now pending before the Committee on Interstate Commerce a bill introduced by me providing that a commission may be appointed by the President which shall investigate these matters, and the results of such investigation would command the respect of the country. No investigation that shows itself to have been partisan or to have been made with the case prejudged by the character of the investigators would have any weight in settling the controversies. I believe that a properly informed public sentiment would settle this strike, and I repeat, I have asked in a bill that such a commission be appointed by the President of the United States. I have asked the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce to call that bill up in order that such a commission might be created, whose duties it should be to go into these matters in detail and in such a way that the result would command the respect of the public.

I object to this particular resolution because I feel that no good could come from it and that conditions would be made worse instead of better. I object to it at this time because I want the authorities who have been investigating the disturbance to report, and I want them to have sufficient time to make their report. You answer that this condition has been in existence a long time; that we have waited long enough. Oh, but Senators do not understand the complications that have existed there. I do not believe a majority of the Senators want to impeach the honor and integrity of the Democratic governor of Michigan. His record shows that he has been in sympathy with the toiling classes quite as much as with the other classes of our people. I do not believe any man who has carefully investigated this matter and understands Michigan's history wants to impeach the courts of our State. I do not believe Senators want to interfere with the work that is now being performed by the grand jury in reference to this particular trouble.

It is for these reasons that I have asked that due care be taken before we complicate the situation and perhaps unduly prolong the strike. If you can by congressional action, if you can by investigation, throw on the subject more light than has been thrown on it, I have no objection to it. The people of Michigan have no objection to it. But such a commission should be unbiased by political or class prejudice. If we could get a report upon the commission bill that has been once reported to Congress and several times considered by congressional committees since I have been a Member here and have the measure enacted into law, this and other great controversies between capital and labor would be settled without such tremendous loss to the parties directly involved and to the people. Such a commission was created by President Roosevelt in the anthracite coal strike, and that without any authority of law, but he recognized the seriousness of the strike and appreciated that publicity of the truth was the sure and direct remedy. Its findings would command the respect of the country and end the strike. In fact, no such long-continued disturbance would occur if it was known

in advance that the exact truth would be disclosed. No wrong thing could stand the judgment of public opinion. By all means let us have light, and for the same reason let us not becloud an already bad situation.

THE TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE AS ADJUNCTS TO POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska submits a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its present consideration. It will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 242) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate the results of the investigation he has been making regarding Government ownership and control of means of communication with a view to the acquisition by the Government of the telegraph and telephone facilities, to be operated as an adjunct to the postal service, and that in connection therewith he send to the Senate all of the data and information that has been acquired by means of such investigation, together with a copy of all reports that have been made thereon by any committee or persons appointed by him for the purpose of making such investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BACON subsequently said: Mr. President, there was a resolution just adopted by the Senate, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], which I am somewhat inclined to think should go first for consideration to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The chairman of that committee is not now present. I therefore will not do more than enter a motion for a reconsideration, so that if the members of that committee should think it desirable they could make a motion for a reconsideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider will be noted.

PARITY OF EXCHANGE BETWEEN GOLD AND SILVER USING COUNTRIES.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask for the reading of Senate joint resolution No. 89.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read Senate joint resolution 89.

The Secretary read the joint resolution introduced by Mr. THOMAS December 13, 1913, as follows:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) for the appointment of an international commission to fix a parity of exchange between gold and silver using countries.

Whereas the purpose of H. R. 7837 now under consideration in the Senate is to establish a permanent and satisfactory system of banking and currency equal at all times to the demands of the Nation's economic and commercial requirements; and

Whereas a system of banking and currency to be thoroughly efficient must be adaptable as well to the needs of foreign and domestic trade; and

Whereas the recent growth of our foreign trade justifies the assurance of its rapid and continuous expansion; and

Whereas the markets of the world include China, Japan, India, the Straits Settlements, Mexico, and South America, which countries embrace nearly two-thirds of the human race, and whose industrial and commercial affairs are transacted upon a silver basis, notwithstanding their nominal adoption of a gold standard; and

Whereas changes in the gold price of silver bullion causes constant and sometimes violent fluctuation in exchanges between gold and silver using countries, seriously disturbing all current commercial transactions between them; and

Whereas every fall in these exchanges operates as a bounty upon exports from silver-using countries, and imposes a burden upon imports to them from gold-using countries, thereby converting trade relations between them into a mere gamble in silver; and

Whereas these conditions place the United States and other gold-standard countries at a great disadvantage in competition in agriculture and manufacturing industries, and have for years stimulated the transfer of such industries from gold-using countries to silver-using countries, where the price of wages and raw material have undergone no change during the past half century; and

Whereas the efforts of Great Britain to overcome these evils in India by placing that great dependency upon a "gold-exchange basis," and by government coinage of the rupee, whose exchange value it has vainly sought to maintain by law, have resulted disastrously and caused a constantly increasing drainage of gold from England to India, where it disappears from the channels of trade and exchange; and

Whereas in consequence of such failure Great Britain has created a royal commission, now sitting at Whitehall, to "inquire into the measures taken by the Indian Government to maintain the exchange value of the rupee in pursuance of, or supplementary to, the recommendations of the Indian currency committee of 1898; and whether the existing practice in these matters is conducive to the interests of India," thus indicating the gravity of trade and currency conditions, caused by the dislocation of exchanges and evidenced by the partial destruction of India's foreign trade and her absorption of gold; and

Whereas the problems submitted to said royal commission for solution are of common international concern, affecting their trade and menacing the gold reserves of all nations; and

Whereas no national system of banking and currency however sound can fully serve the people while international trade is subject to constant and violent fluctuations of international exchange: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be empowered to suggest to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, and France the appointment of delegates by them and by the United States to an international conference to consider and recommend to their respective Governments a common plan and method by which a parity or fixity of exchange may be established between them and the silver-using nations of the world.

Resolved further, That when and as soon as any two of said Governments shall favorably respond, the President is hereby authorized to appoint delegates to such conference, not to exceed five in number, and who shall be empowered to represent the United States thereat, and who shall report to the President the result of their deliberations, with such recommendations as they shall deem essential to the accomplishment of the end desired.

Resolved further, That the sum of \$100,000, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, be appropriated to pay the expenses of the delegates so to be appointed by the President to said conference.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the object which the preamble and resolutions just read are designed to subserve is the essential adjunct of every currency system in the civilized world. Until it shall have been attained they are alike inefficient in one of their most vital functions. Unless, therefore, leading commercial powers shall recognize this fact and by concert of action establish this object by cooperative agreement, their fiscal and commercial relations with Asiatic and South American communities must be exposed to the perils which spring from unsettled and fitful changes in the value of foreign money, perils which have been in operation for years, drastic in result and ominous in their portent. International trade is largely dependent for its success, and therefore for its healthy expansion, upon a reasonable and reliable parity or fixity of exchange between the nations. Without this it is largely speculative, being subject to the hazard of rise or fall in the relative value of money of one country expressed in terms of the money of another, changes in which must operate to the advantage of the country whose money occupies the lower end of the scale. The changes subsidize its exports in proportion as their fluctuations are great or small. They also penalize its imports and thus compel the domestic production of their principal elements.

Two-thirds of the world's inhabitants occupy the continents of Asia and South America. Within the past quarter of a century most, if not all, of the peoples of these continents have outwardly conformed to the monetary policies of the great manufacturing nations of the world by nominally adopting what is called the gold-exchange standard of values. Hitherto they were both legally and actually upon the silver standard. They are still, in fact, upon that standard, and will remain so. The settled customs of centuries and the needs of business have forced them to conform in practice to the old methods and the old system, notwithstanding their codes and statutes. Wages, contracts, and the innumerable small transactions of daily life go on as before. In Asia silver and in South America silver or paper are the medium through which these are expressed and discharged. And the nations which deal with them which covet their trade and seek their valuable markets must reckon with this fact, for it is a portentous one, affecting not our foreign commerce alone but our domestic, industrial, and political conditions as well.

I must here assure the Senate that I have no intention of discussing the old issue of bimetallism. I shall make no plea for the free coinage of silver. I shall neither frighten the timid nor beguile the tolerant by any appeal for a return to the money of the Constitution, for I know how useless and perhaps how tiresome that would be. Although I am as strong in my conviction of the virtues of the bimetallic standard as when I first espoused the doctrine, although bimetallism has by an unrepented and therefore by an existing law been solemnly declared to be the policy of this Nation, I realize that for the time its day has passed and it must await the hour of its certain resurrection. And while I earnestly believe that the future will vindicate the mighty struggle of its advocates for its reestablishment in America, and that the inexorable needs of commercial intercourse among the nations will again lift the white metal to its rightful place as the twin monetary metal of the world, I know that in this age the United States will adhere to its prevailing standard and shape its financial legislation in harmony with the provisions of the act of 1908. I bow to this condition because I must. I therefore recognized and discharged my duty to the country by supporting the banking and currency bill.

Mr. President, the effort to place the economic development, the commerce, and the credits of both hemispheres upon a gold basis has been foredoomed to failure. The contracts and obligations of Europe and North America resting upon that metal are more than ten times the world's supply. They can never be liquidated according to the terms of the bond unless the golden stores of nature to be hereafter discovered and appropriated shall multiply present production manifold. And foreign commerce is increasing at the rate of 7 per cent per annum, while the yearly output increases the world's gold supply but 3 per

cent. To place that metal under our trade with Asia is as impossible as would be the attempt to transport an army of 50,000 men upon vessels with a maximum capacity of 10,000 men. Of course, it has become the sole money of international exchange, for it is the money of the manufacturing nations. But this supreme fact is the fundamental cause of the fluctuations in exchange, since the pressure upon gold is reflected in the price of all commodities, which now include the money of the trading nations. Bismarck long ago likened its limited supply to a blanket wholly insufficient to cover all seeking shelter under it, and whose struggles to possess it kept some of them continually bare. And whatever intensifies the struggle sends exchange down, to the confusion of those whose trade balances are with the silver-using nations.

But, Mr. President, this conclusion emphasizes the importance of pointing to one of the evils, and the most formidable one, which has resulted from our discard of silver as primary money, and which urgently requires correction, for we must reckon with the great fact that so long as silver, population considered, carries the major part of the world's commercial burdens—as a slave, perhaps, but carries them nevertheless—and so long as we trade with countries using that metal as their medium of domestic exchange, we in common with the other gold-using countries are directly and deeply concerned in steadying its value and promoting its efficiency at some predetermined ratio.

In 1897 President McKinley, recognizing this great truth, appointed the Wolcott Commission to deal with it by securing some measure of international cooperation with reference to it, a commission authorized by Congress and commanding the warm support of men like the late Senator Hoar. It came to nought, through the opposition of the Indian Viceroy, whose ill-timed counsel was permitted to override the approval of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour.

In conveying to the French Chamber of Deputies the miscarriage of this historic effort Mons. Meline said:

Monometallists, unfortunately, can not wipe out the fact that there are 900,000,000 human beings who know only silver, use only silver, trade only with silver, and do not want gold. Facing these there are 400,000,000 of gold monometallists. It is true that they belong to the richest and most powerful nations who are the creditors of the universe; but these nations would be unwise if, intoxicated by their present power, they should despise their opponents, for these opponents, the silver countries, are young and vigorous. Their labor is cheap and they wait only for the hand of the engineer and the eye of the overseer. Nay; for they already have them.

If we add to these advantages those offered by the silver standard, which allows their selling their products in our markets at a low rate and acts as a protective barrier at home, favoring their development of their industries, we must not be surprised some day if we see the balance turn in their favor, to the great detriment of the nations now so proud of their gold standard. We are, unfortunately, powerless to decide this question single handed; it is a problem of international importance. No Government can solve it according to its own views; it can only urge the solution which it deems preferable.

Mr. President, the question has become more momentous with the passage of every year since these fateful words were uttered, and we have done nothing. In common with Great Britain and Germany, we have stood still while the evil has increased. Its causes are obvious, its progress inevitable.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that in China, Japan, and other silver-using countries the rate of wages and the value of raw material are constant, and are reckoned and paid in silver or its equivalent. Revolutions in the world's standards have not affected these conditions. The cost of a day's labor is the same as it was in 1870 and is paid in the same money. The value of oriental produce and raw material is practically the same and reckoned by the same standard. Stated conversely the purchasing power of the silver coin has persisted as to all transactions and commodities in these countries, although it has fallen in value when measured in gold. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that he who produces in China on a silver basis may sell in the United States on a gold basis, exchanges his gold for silver, and reap a harvest of profit, gauged, however, by the rate of exchange then prevailing. The system operates as a bounty on exports, which increases with every fall in the gold value of silver, and decreases with every rise in that value. Silver depression means prosperity to the silver-using nations, and menaces in turn not the export trade of gold-using countries only, but their manufacturers as well, for the bounty which the silver-using country enjoys under these conditions places a corresponding embargo upon its imports, which requires it to supply them by producing them at home. And this is the competition and the only competition of cheap foreign labor with the labor of America which we may justly fear. It can not be neutralized by tariff laws, which do not even check it, for it proceeds from the dislocation of our exchanges with those of nations where cheap labor is abundant. And so it was inevitable that manufacturers for the oriental trade would be, as they have been forced to transplant many of their factories to Asia,

and that rival establishments should spring into existence not only to compete with them for the local markets, but to invade those of England and the United States as well.

This is neither a new question nor a new condition. It is an old and a persistent one. It has long confronted us. It manifested itself as soon as its causes were developed. In 1892 the North Island of Hakodate, in Japan, advertised for bids for 1,500 tons of iron pipe for street mains. A British firm obtained the contract at 4 sovereigns per ton. At the rate of exchange then prevalent this cost the purchaser 28 of its silver dollars. In 1893 the preconceived assault upon silver in the United States synchronized with England's closure of the Indian mints. Silver fell 9 pence an ounce within the month. In 1894 Hakodate advertised for bids for another 1,500 tons of iron pipes. The same British firm responded with the same bid. But now the exchange had fallen to 40 silver dollars for 4 sovereigns. Therefore Hakodate rejected all bids, erected her own foundry, supplied her own needs, and since then has become an exporter of iron pipes to China and India.

In 1894 the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce warned London that—

Every month of delay in monetary reform does not only a temporary but a permanent injury to the trade of all countries having a gold standard, as although the eventual righting of the silver question may check the further establishment of mills in Japan and China those already erected will remain keen competitors of the mills and factories of Lancashire and the west, and there will be great difficulty in ever again getting back the trade now being diverted. Already under the influence of cheap silver a large proportion of the trade east of the Suez Canal is finding for itself new channels which will gradually be closed to western competition.

In 1903 Sir Thomas Jackson said to the Straits currency commission:

I was in Shanghai in 1867; then the only items of export were tea and silk. Now the low exchange has enabled them to export all sorts of things—hides, tallow, wax. In fact, in a ship of 6,000 tons you will find tea and silk not 5 per cent of the cargo. There are a hundred and one articles exported from China now that were impossible to export 30 years ago.

And one of my predecessors in this Chamber, Senator Teller, shortly afterwards said:

Five gold dollars or 1 sovereign used to purchase 3 taels only, and 3 taels then paid the wages for one day of 25 Chinese mill hands, while to-day 5 gold dollars buy 8 taels, and 8 taels a day pay a day's wage not to 25 but 60 Chinese mill hands; such is the nature of the protest which sums up our silver philosophy.

In 1909 Tong Shoa Yi, first prime minister under the Republic, wrote:

In China fluctuations in exchange such as those of last year are of course very troublesome for our importing merchants; still no doubt last year's fall in silver greatly assists our mills and other manufacturing industries which might be damaged by the competition of imported foreign goods if the exchange rose. Thus the fall in exchange is even as an increasing tariff, but unlike a tariff our exports are not reduced, but, so to speak, subsidized.

A list of textile and metal factories and foundries now operating in China, India, and Japan, which have been erected since the great silver debacle of 1893, would be most interesting; but I have not had time to tabulate them. Mr. Moreton Frewen, who has devoted his great abilities to a study and solution of this mighty problem, says:

China, unable to buy our gold (exchange) and thus our iron and steel, for the first time in history erected for herself in Hankow great steel rolling mills, and commenced the export of pig iron in full cargoes. Han-yang is to-day selling high-grade pig iron f. o. b. for 16 taels a ton. Now, the gold price of 16 taels in 1873 was 5 guineas; in 1907 it was still £2 16s., and in 1908 only £1 18s. 6d. It is quite safe to say that no white labor in the world has ever produced pig iron of such good quality for any such gold price, and for this sinister genesis of a new industrial era in China, for which to-day the Panama Canal yawns, the conversion in exchange caused by the Simla silver operations in 1907 must be held directly responsible. A recent number of an American scientific periodical says: "Five years ago Japan and China boasted but two small steel plants. To-day these two plants are employing more persons than any steel company in the world, with the exception of the United States Steel Corporation, and one-third as many as the latter. These companies not only supply most of the needs of their own countries but recently captured a big order for the Philippines, in which American, British, and German firms were bidding."

A few years ago China began to export pig iron to Seattle and San Francisco at prices which American producers could barely afford to meet. They clamored for more protection, which they needed, but not by way of increased duties. They ascribed China's iron invasion to her cheap labor, which was true, but it was made efficient solely through the fall in our exchanges with that country. When this rises the invasion is checked and ceases if the rise be great, when the tide turns in the other direction. This is attested by the experiences of 1906 to 1908.

American merchants noticed in 1908 all down the Pacific coast that trade conditions with China between such ports as San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle had become suddenly reversed. Ships in 1906 and 1907 had been running west full and returning almost empty; but in 1908 they sailed west empty to return with full cargoes of Chinese products, and especially pig iron. Let me instance the case of the great Oregon and Washington lumber interests. Good dressed lumber from Portland had cost the Shanghai buyer in 1907 \$30 gold per

thousand feet. At the exchange of 1907 this was 33 silver taels, but at the exchange of 1908 \$30 gold now cost the Shanghai buyer 48 taels, whereas he was able to buy similar lumber from the Manchurian mills in the Yalu River for 39 taels. These figures are, of course, equally applicable to the westbound exports of steel rails and cotton goods or wheat and flour.

So shrewd an observer of trade currents and conditions as James J. Hill could not fail to perceive this undesirable situation nor to discern its causes. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should have directed attention to it. Through the columns of the *World's Work* for January, 1910, under the caption of "A lost opportunity on the Pacific," he said:

As soon as capital is supplied to develop her native resources she (China) will furnish her own raw materials for manufacture, buying them in her own markets on the silver basis, and selling them abroad on the gold basis. This will enable her, as long as her own people are content to accept these low silver prices for material and labor, to cut our prices in two. Bar silver sells at about 52 cents per ounce in New York. On this basis the silver in a dollar is worth about 45 cents. The Chinese manufacturer who can pay his workman his low wage with silver worth its face and sell his product for gold that is convertible into silver at twice its face has an advantage which we can not ignore or escape.

Mr. Charles Denby, United States consul general at Shanghai, reported in 1908 that—

When silver is high, imports are increased; when silver falls, importations become unprofitable and heavy losses result upon goods in stock. Importing firms have found their legitimate trades seriously embarrassed during the past 12 months by the depreciation of silver. Fluctuations in value of local currency ruined hundreds of Chinese merchants who had dealings with foreigners. Normally this depreciation would have considerably stimulated the export trades.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Colorado suspend for a moment? The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Colorado, and that it be then taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside, and the Senator from Colorado will proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is perhaps unprofitable to quote further from those who have written or reported upon this all-important subject, for the testimony is all one way. I must, however, refer to another of its many phases before proceeding to a discussion of possible remedies.

The steady level of wages in silver-using countries means their decrease in terms of gold. As gold rises in value when quoted in silver currency, the same amount of gold translated into silver increases in purchasing power in their labor markets. The effect of this condition in substituting silver-paid labor for gold-paid labor is nowhere more vividly illustrated than upon the Pacific marine, where the labor of the Orient has almost wholly supplanted that of the Occident. Mr. Kopsch, of Shanghai, says that—

Silver-paid Chinese labor has driven every European sailor and fireman from the decks and stokeholds of foreign vessels plying on the coast of China, and the premium paid by gold countries to silver labor will crush the efforts of the machinist to reap the profit of his toil in the East just as it has vanquished the seaman.

All Americans deplore the decay and disappearance of our country's merchant marine, and all would unite in resort to every available method for its restoration. But it would be a melancholy satire upon our institutions and our policy if, when ships of commerce shall again fly the American ensign on every sea, their enginemen, their crews, and their coal heavers should consist of yellow men recruited from the exhaustless supplies of the Far East, to the exclusion of our own people, because they toil for a wage reckoned and paid in the coin which they and their ancestors have for centuries accepted as the unchanging symbol and standard of human values.

The problem will in the space of a few short months lie directly in our commercial pathway. It is the real yellow peril. The completion of the Panama Canal is vastly more than the greatest engineering achievement of the human race or the opening of a new highway for the commerce of the world. As Hugo said of Waterloo, "It is a change of front of the universe." It shrinks the earth into smaller compass and brings its races into closer contact. It will companion Atlantic lanes of travel with watery avenues of traffic across the illimitable expanses of the great South Sea. The goal of American and European rivalries will be the markets that lie upon Asiatic shores. And these will be held by their own peoples as best they can. Long ago they perceived that to do this their counter invasion of our markets was indispensable. This will be as well their policy of the future as of the past. Panama cutting distance in twain is wholly

impartial. Her economic advantages are mutual. She brings us as near to Asia as she brings Asia near to us. And with dislocated exchanges whose fluctuations are but occasionally upward, how shall Europe and America overcome their handicap?

The trouble—

Said the late Senator Jones, of Nevada, the greatest political economist of his day in public life, in a letter of May 5, 1908, to Mr. Frewen—

is not now with our currency or yours, but is in the exchanges between the West and the Orient. This involves us in the most complex economic problem of our time. For if gold prices are to continue to rise—as too surely they will rise, and silver prices to fall—what a crisis it is which looms ahead. There is nothing, it seems to me, stranger nor much sadder in history than the fact that public opinion has been so drugged and duped that it sees nothing in the exchanges with one-half of the human race excepting the price of the silver bullion of Nevada.

On the 3d of December last the president of the United States Steel Corporation delivered an illuminating address in the city of Chicago upon the subject of export trade. His knowledge of the subject is much more comprehensive than mine. I was therefore pleased to note that he had been an observer of our trade relations with the Orient, and alive to the actual and latent competition which there confronts us. He says:

The remarkable ingenuity and adaptability of the Japanese and the enormous population and latent possibilities of China must be reckoned with in considering the future struggle for the trade of the world. In the products manufactured by Japan, actual competition with her in Asiatic markets, on which her ambition is particularly concentrated, enables one to realize the extent of her activities. Japan, aside from shipping one-third of her exports to the United States, now dominates the trade of China in piece goods, which formerly were largely obtained from Great Britain and America. Formerly Japan exported raw materials which they now buy and export in the form of manufactured goods, and are rapidly becoming, like Russia, an increasing factor in the business economies of the world. Japan's exports having increased from \$200,000,000 in 1908 to \$263,000,000 in 1912.

Mr. Farrell does not refer to the stimulus which falling exchanges have given this growing trade, but he is too intelligent an observer of modern economics and too closely identified with one of our greatest industries to have overlooked it. And all must perceive that Japan has within recent years become a great carrier nation. Her merchant marine, equipped with crews recruited from her own people and paid a silver wage that has not varied for a century, is visibly increasing. She will soon dominate the transportation of the Pacific, for she can do the work more cheaply than Great Britain and far more cheaply than we can. Is it patriotic, is it wise, is it even expedient to ignore these most obvious conditions and let them drift without some effort to correct them? Is national prejudice against an ancient money metal so strong, the opposition to its use so bigoted, that the commerce of a hemisphere is to be jeopardized, if not lost, because of it?

If so, let me remind my hearers that this is but half the problem, for as water reaches its level, and as the nation which can sell the cheapest will outstrip its competitors in the race for commercial supremacy, so will our own markets become in time the prize of other lands upon whose wares we have placed a subsidy by outlawing their currency in the exchange of the world and then keeping it subject to all the contingencies which accompany the changing values of gold. Our ultimate stake may be the retention of what we have rather than the obtaining of what we desire. It would be a melancholy sequel to our construction of the Panama Canal if it should ultimately prove rather a portal for the incoming fleets of eastern commerce than an outlet for the distribution of our own.

Mr. President, it is fortunate for our purpose that this evil is not an unmixed one. The importers of the Far East suffer from its existence, and these are eager to aid in its avoidance. Payments to America and Europe in trade balances and interest upon public and private debts held in Europe and America must be made in gold or its equivalent. These counter burdens are sometimes severe, while the uncertainty always surrounding exchange makes the subsidy it confers fitful and inconstant. Hence we may be reasonably sure that Asia and South America and Mexico will welcome any solution of the problem which promises permanent and reasonably steady equilibrium.

The thoughtful students of this universal difficulty have been able to suggest but one effective remedy for it, and that has never been tried. I shall discuss it presently. Before doing so it is well to refer to one whose experimental stages I trust are over, and which instead of removing has vastly aggravated the evil. I allude to England's effort to establish the gold standard in India. That great dependency has been silver's reservoir of the centuries. She has absorbed it from the remotest periods, like a sponge absorbing water. She has held what she has received, parting with practically none of her constantly accumulating store. She has been rightly called "the sink of silver." Her rupee is her standard of value, worth

nominally about 48 cents, or 11 to the sovereign. Until 1803 their coinage was free. Her people hoarded or melted them and transformed them into ornaments, always available for money in times of need. After 1803 and until the establishment of the recommendations of the Fowler committee of 1808 their hordes of silver, whether coined or melted, were still available for their needs. The Viceroy, in 1807, rejected the proposals of the Wolcott committee, because their first effect would be an intense disturbance of Indian trade and industry by the sudden rise in the rate of exchange, and that would kill India's export trade, "for the time at least." He would prefer the bounty which Indian exports then enjoyed through the cheapening of silver bullion to the substantial relief of all international trade. Great Britain accepted his conclusions, and then facing about in 1900 deprived India of that advantage by imposing the gold standard upon her people. To make that standard effective she determined upon governmental coinage of the rupee and upon a forced maintenance of its value at 15 to the sovereign. This appeared possible by regulating their coinage as the exigencies of trade and exchange required, by suspending their coinage entirely or by locking them up when seemingly redundant, and by imports of gold when needed through the exchange of rupees or rupee paper at that ratio. But silver continued to transact the business of the country. The Hindoo was joined to his kind of money and would not turn to some other. Mr. Dunbar, treasurer of the Bank of Bengal, has recently said that—

Gold currency in India is a wasteful and expensive luxury. There is any amount of funds in India. It is simply that rupees are locked up by the Government. We want rupees, and we can not import rupees; we can import sovereigns and "concoils," but it is rupees we want, and they are locked up.

This policy did, however, give China and Japan the same advantage over India through the fall of its exchange which the three countries had theretofore enjoyed in common against Europe and the United States. The rupees beyond India were not 15 to the sovereign, but what the current gold value of silver was to the sovereign. And the exports of that unhappy country withered and dried up, with no compensating advantage.

Such were conditions in February, 1910, when the Government as a last stimulus to its pallid experiment imposed a high tariff upon all imports of silver bullion to India. Let Mr. Frewen tell the consequences:

For the financial year 1909, while the imports of gold into India had fallen off more than 8,000,000 sovereigns as compared with 1908, the import of silver, on the other hand, showed an increase for the year of over 17 per cent, and this albeit there was already a duty of 5 per cent on all imported silver. It was now evident that unless heroic measures were adopted to save the gold-exchange standard, the ineradicable preference of the natives for the metal of every Indian contract and obligation for hundreds of years would yet override the various orders in council at Simla. Therefore in February, 1910, the natives, who had in times past drawn their trade balances in either of the two precious metals, were informed that if they took payment in an ounce of gold they would receive an ounce of gold, but if in a hundred tolas of silver they must hand over to the sarkar 16 tolas. It is little wonder the proportions of the two metals imported were gold to silver as 1 to 31; last year the proportion of gold to silver had become 8 to 1, and the importation of silver had shrunk to negligible dimensions. During the two complete financial years which have elapsed since the imposition of the silver duties, India—including sums on deposit in London—has taken about 73,000,000 sovereigns of our gold, or at the rate of over 100,000 daily. Yet in spite of the warning of the native members of the viceroy's council, this silver tax, unprecedented in the whole world's history, has been persisted in. It had the inevitable and the foreseen result of discrediting silver with the natives, of checking the Indian absorption of the white metal—which absorption by raising the rate of tael exchange enables China to purchase our commodities—and, what is far more important, it set in motion to the hoards of India that great exodus of our gold which is the most sinister economic feature of our time. If the 75,000,000 sovereigns of which India has deprived us in the past two years were still available when and where needed, through the action of our exchanges it is safe to say our bank rate would to-day be 3 per cent consols 1½ points higher, and the city of London full of vigor and confidence. The great drain of gold to India, which represents the culmination of the half-dozen differing views of the half-dozen financial empires in Calcutta and Simla during the past 20 years, has jeopardized, as Sir Edward Holden has so admirably pointed out, not our gold reserves only or chiefly, but the gold reserves in New York, Paris, and Berlin.

Mr. President, this unhappy juggling with Indian finances has resulted in the absorption by that country since 1900 of more than \$700,000,000 of gold from Europe, which is entirely lost to trade. The drain has increased abnormally since 1910, and will continue to so increase until Britain abandons her policy and recognizes the grave danger with which that policy menaces all the monetary systems of Europe. When the Fowler committee began its inquiries consols were at 111; they are now about 75. If Indian gold were available to commerce, if it there continued to circulate in the channels of trade, stimulating industry and promoting adventure, its translation to that country would not be a subject of universal solicitude. But the native is learning from a bitter experience that silver is not money in India,

"They will welcome our initiative. Their common interest in the common handicap means speedy response, and response means speedy and effective cooperation. And when the world's exchange mediums shall have been adjusted and the last obstacle to an universal commerce shall have been removed each of the nations will have a fair field and need ask no favors.

Mr. President, I move that Senate joint resolution No. 89 be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I request that the unfinished business be now laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 48.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, but that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon asks that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection, and the formal reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

The amendment reported by the Committee on Territories was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be located such main lines for railroads from points on tidewater to the interior as will, in his judgment, best promote the settlement of Alaska, develop its resources, and provide adequate and suitable transportation for coal for the Army, Navy, and other Government services; of troops, arms, and munitions of war; of the mails, and for other Government and public uses, together with such branch lines, feeders, sidings, switches, and spurs as he may deem necessary; and when such line or lines are located he is hereby authorized to cause to be constructed, completed, equipped, and operated thereon (until otherwise provided by Congress) a railroad or railroads, with the necessary equipment, docks, wharves, and terminal facilities: *Provided*, That the President may cause said road or roads to be operated by contract or lease, but no contract or lease shall be for a longer period than 10 years.

Sec. 2. That to enable the President to construct and operate the railroad or railroads and works appurtenant and necessary thereto, as provided in this act, he is hereby authorized to employ, in the ascertainment of the location of said railroad lines and in the construction, completion, equipment, and operation of the same, any of the engineers of the United States Army, at his discretion, and likewise to employ any engineers in civil life, at his discretion, and such other persons as he may deem necessary for the proper and expeditious prosecution of said work. The duties, powers, and compensation of such engineers and other persons employed under this act shall be fixed by the President. The official salary of any official appointed or employed under this act shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided for or which shall be fixed under the terms of this act. The officers or other persons placed in charge of the work by the President shall make to the President annually and at such other periods as may be required by the President or by either House of Congress full and complete reports of all their acts and doings and of all money received and expended in the construction of said work and in the operation of said work or works and in the performance of their duties in connection therewith. The annual reports herein provided for shall be by the President transmitted to Congress. The President may acquire, by purchase or condemnation, all property he may deem necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, and he may exercise in the name of the United States the power of eminent domain in the courts of Alaska in accordance with the laws now or hereafter in force for that purpose. A right of way over the lands of the United States in Alaska shall be acquired for such railway lines upon filing in the General Land Office a map or maps approved by the President showing the line of the railroad or railroads and the boundaries of the lands reserved for such road or roads, and the President may, in this manner or otherwise, make reservation of such lands as are or may be useful for furnishing materials for construction and for stations, terminals, docks, and for such other purposes in connection with the construction and operation of such railroad lines as he may deem necessary and desirable; and he may utilize in carrying on the work herein provided for any and all machinery, equipment, instruments, material, and other property of any sort whatsoever used or acquired in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, so far and as rapidly as the same is no longer needed at Panama; and the said Isthmian Canal Commission is hereby authorized to deliver said property to such officers or persons as the President may designate, and to take credit therefor at such percentage of its original cost as the President may approve, but this amount shall not be charged against the fund provided for in section 5 of this act.

Sec. 3. Subject to the approval of the President, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have the power to fix, change, and modify rates for the transportation of freight and passengers on any railroad or railroads constructed and operated under the provisions of this act, which rates shall be the same to all.

No free transportation or passes shall be permitted and no discrimination as to rates shall be made in favor of the Government or its officers or agents: *Provided*, That the provisions of the interstate-commerce laws relating to the transportation of employees and their families shall be in force as to lines constructed under this act.

Sec. 4. That any line of railroad designated and constructed under the provisions of this act may connect with the line of any railroad existing or which may hereafter be constructed in Alaska, or with any steamship line for joint transportation of freight and passengers, and

in such case the lines thus connected shall be operated as a through route with through rates upon a fair and reasonable apportionment of revenue and expenses.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow, on the credit of the United States, from time to time, as the proceeds may be required to defray expenditures authorized by this act (such proceeds when received to be used only for the purpose of meeting such expenditure), the sum of \$40,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and to prepare and issue therefor coupon or registered bonds of the United States, in such form as he may prescribe and in denominations of \$20 or some multiple of that sum, redeemable in gold coin at the pleasure of the United States after 10 years from the date of their issue, and payable 30 years from such date, and bearing interest, payable quarterly in gold coin, at the rate of 3 per cent per annum; and the bonds herein authorized shall be exempt from all taxes or duties of the United States as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority: *Provided*, That said bonds may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, giving to all the citizens of the United States an equal opportunity to subscribe therefor, but no commissions shall be allowed or paid thereon, and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000, to be used for carrying out the provisions of this act, including the expense of preparing, advertising, and issuing the bonds herein authorized, to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That so much of the said sum of \$1,000,000 as shall have been expended shall be reimbursed to the Treasury out of the first proceeds of the sale of said bonds.

Sec. 6. That there is hereby created a redemption fund in the United States Treasury, to be known as the "Alaska railways redemption fund," into which shall be paid 75 per cent of all moneys derived from the sale or disposal of any of the public lands in Alaska, or the coal or mineral contents thereof, or the timber thereon, and into which fund shall be paid the net earnings of said railroad or railroads above maintenance charges and operating expenses; the said redemption fund, or any part thereof, may be used from time to time, upon the order of the President, to pay the interest on the bonds authorized and issued under the provisions of this act and to redeem, cancel, and retire said bonds under such rules and regulations as the President may establish.

Sec. 7. That it is the intent of this act to authorize and empower the President to do any and all things necessary to carry out and accomplish the purposes of this act.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is amusing, Mr. President, in the light of latter-day investigations and knowledge, to read the discussions in Congress at the time the bill was pending for making an appropriation of \$7,200,000 in payment to Russia for her possessions in North America. This was the sum which the treaty, negotiated by Hon. W. H. Seward, Secretary of State, provided should be paid for these possessions, and opposition developed to the making of an appropriation to carry out the treaty stipulations. While Mr. Seward was commended in many quarters of the country for his foresight and statesmanship, he was roundly denounced in others for negotiating a treaty for the purchase of a territory which was practically unknown, and to the casual observer simply a frozen, barren wilderness. House bill 1096, making the necessary appropriation to carry out the treaty stipulations, was reported favorably to the House May 18, 1868, with a lengthy report signed by Hon. N. P. Banks for the committee, accompanied by the views of the minority in opposition. These documents show that patient and painstaking consideration was given to the bill, but it conclusively shows that neither the majority nor the minority of the committee knew anything at all about Alaska and its resources as compared with what we know of them to-day. In 50 years from now it will probably be said by those who come after us that we of the present day know as little about the real Alaska as did those who subscribed the reports mentioned.

The report discusses at length, from the information then at hand, the resources of Alaska, including agriculture, wood and timber, coal and other minerals, game, furs, and fisheries, laying particular stress upon the latter. But the report upon these subjects shows, in the light of present information, only slight knowledge of any of them, and the conclusion to favor the then pending measure was based rather upon considerations of public policy than the intrinsic worth of the country from a commercial standpoint. The report of the majority, who reported in favor of an appropriation for the purchase of Alaska, says in conclusion:

These statements upon the character of the territory acquired by the treaty are the results of personal observations made by perfectly reliable public officers and private citizens since the date of the purchase, representing different interests and different parts of the country, moving in different directions and by different courses through the territory by sea and land, and are presented without argument as a just representation of facts already known in support of the treaty.

I might say, incidentally, that I doubt very much if any American citizen up to that date had ever gone through any part of Alaska except, possibly, those portions of the Territory that skirt the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf.

The remarks preceding this part of the report upon the rights of the House in regard to the negotiation of treaties, which were orally presented to the committee, are embodied in the report at the suggestion of members who voted in the affirmative and negative on the final question of reporting the bill herewith presented.

The treaty adds an extended territory to the United States, the political jurisdiction of which will ultimately be indispensable to its peace and power.

It tends largely, directly, strongly, and immediately to the consolidation of the northern Pacific coast line as an American possession. It creates an entirely new industrial interest of vast proportions on the Pacific, the results of which can not now be fully appreciated.

It makes telegraphic communication between the United States and the people of China, Asia, India, and Russia as simple and as feasible as that between New York and San Francisco.

It concentrates the power of Russia and extends that of this country, which together will soon span the entire globe north, and strengthens the mutual friendship and interests that have marked their career since the period when they together first challenged the attention of Europe as continental powers, and began their work of expansion and progression.

It adds greatly to the productive wealth of the country.

It furnishes indispensable ports for American whalers and fishermen in the Pacific and Arctic Oceans.

It furnishes a basis for explorations and discovery in the Arctic region.

It incloses British Columbia within American jurisdiction south, west, and north.

It removes the danger of territorial or maritime jealousies and controversies to which the two countries that have been and ought to remain friends are constantly exposed.

It strengthens the military position of the Government.

For these and other reasons that might be presented, the committee reports to the House the following bill making an appropriation to carry the treaty into effect, with a recommendation that it be enacted into a law.

The Senate will observe that there is only one mention of the commercial value of Alaska to this country in this whole favorable report, and the report itself, taken as a whole, shows that there was very scant knowledge in the possession of the committee at the time the report was filed.

But the suggestion of the woeful lack of information as to the real value of this magnificent acquisition and of the contempt in which the country was held by many persons of that day and generation is disclosed by the discussion of the then pending measure by Hon. C. C. Washburn and Hon. George W. Morgan, the minority members of the committee, who concluded their lengthy statement, as follows:

The minority of the committee, having considered the various questions involved and the evidence in regard to this country under consideration, are forced to the conclusion that the possession of the country is of no value to the Government of the United States; that it will be a source of weakness instead of power, and a constant annual expense for which there will be no adequate return; that it has no capacity as an agricultural country; that, so far as known, it has no value as a mineral country; that its timber is mostly confined to the narrow strip of country only 30 miles wide south of Mount St. Elias, and is generally of a poor quality and growing upon inaccessible mountains; that its fur trade is of insignificant value to us as a Nation, and will speedily come to an end; that the fisheries are of doubtful value, and that whatever the value of its fisheries, its fur trade, its timber, or its minerals, they were all open to the citizens of the United States under existing treaties; that the right to govern a nation or nations of savages in a climate unfit for the habitation of civilized men was not worthy of purchase; that the constitutional right of this House to refuse to appropriate the money was known to Russia at the time the treaty was negotiated, and there can be no charge of bad faith if that right is asserted. They therefore report the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is inexpedient to appropriate money for the purchase of Russian America.

The bill finally passed and was approved July 25, 1868.

I have deemed it advisable to call attention to these reports, because they show not only the conflicting views of the then statesmen but also the lack of information as to the resources of Alaska, even after the purchase had been made and was about to be concluded by an appropriation of the purchase price. They reflect the views of some of our contemporaries who have given the subject no consideration and who still look upon Alaska as a mysterious midnight land, as barren and as worthless as the Arctic regions.

It will be my purpose in the discussion of the pending bill authorizing the construction of a railroad in Alaska to show the wonderful resources of this magnificent empire, what it has added to the wealth of our country, and what its future possibilities are with proper transportation facilities.

The same ignorance with reference to Alaska has been from time to time displayed as was displayed when the acquisition of the Oregon country was under consideration—a country from which have been carved the magnificent Commonwealths of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and part of Wyoming. There were then distinguished men in both branches of Congress who insisted that this splendid country was only fit to be used as a place for the colonization of convicts and outlaws, just as there are men to-day who insist that Alaska is only a fit habitation for the grizzly bear and the fur-bearing seal, wholly useless for the uses of civilized man.

For nearly 30 years after the cession to the United States Alaska was almost entirely ignored by Congress. There were practically no laws for its government, no appropriations for its proper support, and nothing for its development. Almost nothing was done for the betterment of the condition of its citizens until about the time of the discovery of gold in paying quantities, less than 20 years ago.

And then, when on the eve of a development which was calculated to astonish the world, that Government which had neg-

lected its people, which had looked upon it as a wilderness, which had done nothing for its advancement, either commercially or morally, by executive fiat, was compelled to throttle its opportunities by withdrawing nearly all of its resources from private acquisition and control, to protect them from exploitation and monopolization.

In order to show what was done in reference to withdrawals, I asked the Forestry Department to furnish me with a list of the withdrawals in Alaska. I do not wish to be understood as objecting to these withdrawals, because if they had not been made there is no question in the mind of anyone who has given the subject consideration that Alaska's magnificent resources, its copper, its coal, and nearly everything else, would now be in the control of a monopoly. The Alaska Syndicate, composed of the Guggenheims and the Morgans, would have had possession of Alaska just as they now practically control all the gateways to that rich Territory. But these are the withdrawals, and withdrawals made at a time when there were laws in force in Alaska which would have enabled individual enterprise and initiative and effort to have obtained possession of them, but they were being obtained at the expense of the people of this country and in favor of special interests.

Withdrawals in Alaska.

	Acres.
Rand, McNally & Co.'s Atlas gives the total area of Alaska as 590,884 square miles, or	378,165,760
The Tongass National Forest embraces approximately	15,481,000
The Chugach National Forest embraces approximately	11,267,850

The above are the two withdrawals of known area of the greatest quantity of land reserved.

But that is not all.

The coal (November, 1906) and oil (November 3, 1910) withdrawals in Alaska are what are known as blanket withdrawals. They prevent the location and patenting of lands chiefly valuable for coal or oil wherever found. In addition to the coal and oil withdrawals there is another blanket withdrawal applicable to Alaska, which is known as the medicinal spring withdrawal (March 28, 1911). This last named forbids the locating or appropriation and patenting of lands in Alaska surrounding mineral or medicinal springs. In none of these last three cases can a statement be made as to the approximate acreage, since it affects all lands in which these minerals or springs are found.

So by a blanket withdrawal the coal lands, which were one of the most valuable assets of the Territory, were withdrawn.

In 1911 the President withdrew, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, an area so that Congress might consider legislation looking to the construction of a Government-owned railroad. The area withdrawn embraces an area of approximately 250,000 acres.

The next largest withdrawals of which the acreage can be computed are those withdrawals for military and naval purposes in Alaska, to establish coaling stations, telegraph stations, forts, and so forth. The area of these lands is not known, but on August 4, 1911, the Secretary of War informed the Secretary of the Interior that the areas withdrawn at the request of that department were 22,366 acres. No withdrawals of consequence have since been made for military or naval purposes.

The next group of consequence are the areas withdrawn for game, bird, and fish reservations. While the area of these is not known it is not very large. Then, also, there are lands withdrawn for the native Indians, for educational purposes of those Indians, Department of Agriculture experiment station, and lighthouse reservations.

Many of these reservations overlap. For instance, the coal, oil, and medicinal springs reservations may be either within or without the boundaries of the national forests, as will also be found in the case of most of the military, naval, bird, game, and other reservations.

Except for the coal, oil, and medicinal springs reservations, it is possible to compute at least the approximate area of all the others. It would require, however, at least a week's time to do this. The records in the case are all in the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

So it will be seen, Mr. President, that there is practically nothing left to be acquired by private initiative either in the mining section, the coal or the oil section, or under any of the laws of this country.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Are all the withdrawals the Senator has described still in force?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They are all still in force.

Mr. ROBINSON. Over what period of time do the withdrawals extend? How long do they run?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The President may release them by proclamation at any time.

Mr. ROBINSON. How long have they been in force?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Since 1906, practically.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if he can give an approximation of the total acreage of the withdrawals?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The department itself says it can not furnish the information. It is pretty safe to state, I will say to the Senator, that practically everything that is of any value in Alaska has been withdrawn and that the United States owns 99 per cent of the Territory.

Mr. THOMAS. One can not locate even a glacier up there?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Nothing. I believe the glaciers are within forest reserves, generally speaking.

Notwithstanding all this, Alaska has been contributing more money to the arteries of commerce, Mr. President, than is being contributed to this country by the commerce of the Orient, the smaller countries in the east or the west, as I shall prove by statistics furnished by the Department of Commerce.

Alaska has a good homestead law and a good law for the acquisition of rights of way and the development of railways by private corporations.

In order to get it before those who take any interest in the subject—and I assume all Senators will—I am going to ask that those laws be inserted in the Record. They show that the lack of development is not due to the fact that we have not the laws, because we have the best laws governing the subject, but because everything, by blanket and other withdrawals, has been taken from acquisition by private capital or private initiative.

Now, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Record the act approved May 14, 1898, extending the homestead laws and providing for right of way for railroads in the District of Alaska, and for other purposes. I also ask to have inserted the acts approved June 6, 1900, April 28, 1904, and May 28, 1908, for regulating the development of coal mines to show that the laws affecting Alaska are practically more generous in their terms than are the laws which govern the western part of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Permit the Chair to ask the Senator from Oregon if he desires to have this matter printed as an appendix to his remarks?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Chair please, I will have them inserted at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Public, No. 95.]

An act extending the homestead laws and providing for right of way for railroads in the District of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the homestead land laws of the United States and the rights incident thereto, including the right to enter surveyed or unsurveyed lands under provisions of law relating to the acquisition of title through soldiers' additional homestead rights, are hereby extended to the District of Alaska, subject to such regulations as may be made by the Secretary of the Interior; and no indemnity, deficiency, or lieu lands pertaining to any land grant whatsoever originating outside of said District of Alaska shall be located within or taken from lands in said District: *Provided*, That no entry shall be allowed extending more than 80 rods along the shore of any navigable water, and along such shore a space of at least 80 rods shall be reserved from entry between all such claims, and that nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to authorize entries to be made, or title to be acquired, to the shore of any navigable waters within said District: *And it is further provided*, That no homestead shall exceed 80 acres in extent.

SEC. 2. That the right of way through the lands of the United States in the District of Alaska is hereby granted to any railroad company, duly organized under the laws of any State or Territory or by the Congress of the United States, which may hereafter file for record with the Secretary of the Interior a copy of its articles of incorporation, and due proofs of its organization under the same, to the extent of 100 feet on each side of the center line of said road; also the right to take from the lands of the United States adjacent to the line of said road, material, earth, stone, and timber necessary for the construction of said railroad; also the right to take for railroad uses, subject to the reservation of all minerals and coal therein, public lands adjacent to said right of way for station buildings, depots, machine shops, sidetracks, turnouts, water stations, and terminals, and other legitimate railroad purposes, not to exceed in amount 20 acres for each station, to the extent of one station for each 10 miles of its road, excepting at terminals and junction points, which may include additional 40 acres, to be limited on navigable waters to 80 rods on the shore line, and with the right to use such additional ground as may in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior be necessary where there are heavy cuts or fills: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to give to such railroad company, its lessees, grantees, or assigns the ownership or use of minerals, including coal, within the limits of its right of way, or of the lands hereby granted: *Provided further*, That all mining operations prosecuted or undertaken within the limits of such right of way or of the lands hereby granted shall, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, be so conducted as not to injure or interfere with the property or operations of the road over its said lands or right of way. And when such railway shall connect with any navigable stream or tidewater such company shall have power to construct and maintain necessary piers and wharves for connection with water transportation, subject to the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as impairing in any degree the title of any State that may hereafter be erected out of said District, or any part thereof, to tidelands and beds of any of its navigable waters, or the right of such State to regulate the use thereof, nor the right of the United States to resume possession of such lands, it being declared that all such rights shall continue to be held by the United States in trust for the people of any State or States which may hereafter be erected out of said District. The term "navigable waters," as herein used, shall be held to include all tidal waters up to the line of ordinary high tide and all nontidal waters navigable in fact up to the line of ordinary high-water mark. That all charges for the transportation of freight and passengers on railroads in the District of Alaska shall be printed and posted as required by section 6 of an act to regulate commerce as amended on March 2, 1889, and such rates shall be subject to revision and modification by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. That any railroad company whose right of way, or whose track or roadbed upon such right of way, passes through any canyon, pass, or defile shall not prevent any other railroad company from the use and occupancy of said canyon, pass, or defile for the purposes of its road, in common with the road first located, or the crossing of other railroads at grade; and the location of such right of way through any canyon, pass, or defile shall not cause the disuse of any tramway, wagon road, or other public highway now located therein, nor prevent the location through the same of any such tramway, wagon road, or highway where such tramway, wagon road, or highway may be necessary for the public accommodation; and where any change in the location of such tramway, wagon road, or highway is necessary to permit the passage of such railroad through any canyon, pass, or defile, said railroad company shall, before entering upon the ground occupied by such tramway, wagon road, or highway, cause the same to be reconstructed at its own expense in the most favorable location, and in as perfect a manner as the original road or tramway: *Provided*, That such expenses shall be equitably divided between any number of railroad companies occupying and using the same canyon, pass, or defile, and that where the space is limited the United States district court shall require the road first constructed to allow any other railroad or tramway to pass over its track or tracks through such canyon, pass, or defile on such equitable basis as the said court may prescribe; and all shippers shall be entitled to equal accommodations as to the movement of their freight and without discrimination in favor of any person or corporation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as depriving Congress of the right to regulate the charges for freight, passengers, and wharfage.

SEC. 4. That where any company, the right of way to which is hereby granted, shall in the course of construction find it necessary to pass over private lands or possessory claims on lands of the United States, condemnation of a right of way across the same may be made in accordance with section 3 of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes,' approved July 1, 1862," approved July 2, 1864: *Provided further*, That any such company, by filing with the Secretary of the Interior a preliminary actual survey and plat of its proposed route, shall have the right at any time within one year thereafter, to file the map and profile of definite location provided for in this act, and such preliminary survey and plat shall, during the said period of one year from the time of filing the same, have the effect to render all the lands on which said preliminary survey and plat shall pass subject to such right of way.

SEC. 5. That any company desiring to secure the benefits of this act shall, within 12 months after filing the preliminary map of location of its road as hereinbefore prescribed whether upon surveyed or unsurveyed lands, file with the register of the land office for the district where such land is located a map and profile of at least a 20-mile section of its road or a profile of its entire road if less than 20 miles, as definitely fixed, and shall thereafter each year definitely locate and file a map of such location as aforesaid of not less than 20 miles additional of its line of road until the entire road has been thus definitely located, and upon approval thereof by the Secretary of the Interior the same shall be noted upon the records of said office, and thereafter all such lands over which such right of way shall pass shall be disposed of subject to such right of way: *Provided*, That if any section of said road shall not be completed within one year after the definite location of said section so approved, or if the map of definite location be not filed within one year as herein required, or if the entire road shall not be completed within four years from the filing of the map of definite location, the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to any such uncompleted section of said road, and thereupon shall revert to the United States without further action or declaration, the notation of such uncompleted section upon the records of the land office shall be canceled, and the reservations of such lands for the purposes of said right of way, stations, and terminals shall cease and become null and void without further action.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue a permit, by instrument in writing, in conformity with and subject to the restrictions herein contained, unto any responsible person, company, or corporation, for a right of way over the public domain in said District, not to exceed 100 feet in width, and ground for station and other necessary purposes, not to exceed 5 acres for each station for each 5 miles of road, to construct wagon roads and wire rope, aerial, or other tramways, and the privilege of taking all necessary material from the public domain in said District for the construction of such wagon roads or tramways, together with the right, subject to supervision and at rates to be approved by said Secretary, to levy and collect toll or freight and passenger charges on passengers, animals, freight, or vehicles passing over the same for a period not exceeding 20 years, and said Secretary is also authorized to sell to the owner or owners of any such wagon road or tramway, upon the completion thereof, not to exceed 20 acres of public land at each terminus at \$1.25 per acre, such lands when located at or near tidewater not to extend more than 40 rods in width along the shore line and the title thereto to be upon such expressed conditions as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public interest, and all minerals, including coal, in such right of way or station grounds shall be reserved to the United States: *Provided*, That such lands may be located concurrently with the line of such road or tramway, and the plat of preliminary survey and the map of definite location shall be filed as in the case of railroads and subject to the same conditions and limitations: *Provided further*, That such rights of way and privileges shall only be enjoyed by or granted to citizens of the United States or companies or corporations organized under the laws of a State or Territory; and such rights and privileges shall be held subject to the right of Congress to alter, amend, repeal, or grant equal rights to others on contiguous or parallel routes. And no right to construct a wagon road on which toll may be collected shall be granted unless it shall first be made to appear to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that the public convenience requires the construction of such proposed road, and that the expense of making the same available and convenient for public travel will not be less on an average than \$500 per mile: *Provided*, That if the proposed line of road in any case shall be located over any road or trail in common use for public travel, the Secretary of the Interior shall decline to grant such right of way if, in his opinion, the interests of the public would be injuriously affected thereby. Nor shall any right to collect toll upon any wagon road in said District be granted or inure to any person, corporation, or company until it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of said Secretary that at least an average of \$500 per mile has been actually expended in constructing such road; and all persons are prohibited from collecting or attempting to collect toll over any wagon road in said District unless such person or the company or person for whom he acts shall at the time and place the collection is made or

attempted to be made possess written authority, signed by the Secretary of the Interior, authorizing the collection and specifying the rates of toll: *Provided*, That accurate printed copies of said written authority from the Secretary of the Interior, including toll, freight, and passenger charges thereby approved, shall be kept constantly and conspicuously posted at each station where toll is demanded or collected. And any person, corporation, or company collecting or attempting to collect toll without such written authority from the Secretary of the Interior, or failing to keep the same posted as herein required, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be fined for each offense not less than \$50 nor more than \$500, and in default of payment of such fine and costs of prosecution shall be imprisoned in jail not exceeding 90 days, or until such fine and costs of prosecution shall have been paid.

That any person, corporation, or company qualified to construct a wagon road or tramway under the provisions of this act that may heretofore have constructed not less than 1 mile of road, at a cost of not less than \$500 per mile, or one-half mile of tramway at a cost of not less than \$500, shall have the prior right to apply for such right of way and for lands at stations and terminals and to obtain the same pursuant to the provisions of this act over and along the line hitherto constructed or actually being improved by the applicant, including wharves connected therewith. That if any party to whom license has been granted to construct such wagon road or tramway shall, for the period of one year, fail, neglect, or refuse to complete the same, the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to any such uncompleted section of said wagon road or tramway, and thereupon shall revert to the United States without further action or declaration, the notation of such uncompleted section upon the records of the land office shall be canceled, and the reservations of such lands for the purposes of said right of way shall cease and become null and void without further action. And if such road or tramway shall not be kept in good condition for use, the Secretary of the Interior may prohibit the collection of toll thereon pending the making of necessary repairs.

That all mortgages executed by any company acquiring a right of way under this act, upon any portion of its road that may be constructed in said District of Alaska, shall be recorded with the Secretary of the Interior, and the record thereof shall be notice of their execution, and shall be a lien upon all the rights and property of said company as therein expressed, and such mortgage shall also be recorded in the office of the secretary of the District of Alaska and in the office of the secretary of the State or Territory wherein such company is organized: *Provided*, That all lawful claims of laborers, contractors, subcontractors, or material men, for labor performed or material furnished in the construction of the railroad, tramway, or wagon road shall be a first lien thereon and take precedence of any mortgage or other lien.

SEC. 7. That this act shall not apply to any lands within the limits of any military, park, Indian, or other reservation unless such right of way shall be provided for by act of Congress.

SEC. 8. That Congress hereby reserves the right at any time to alter, amend, or repeal this act or any part thereof; and the right of way herein and hereby authorized shall not be assigned or transferred in any form whatever prior to the construction and completion of at least one-fourth of the proposed mileage of such railroad, wagon road, or tramway, as indicated by the map of definite location, except by mortgages or other liens that may be given or secured thereon to aid in the construction thereof: *Provided*, That where within 90 days after the approval of this act, proof is made to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that actual surveys, evidenced by designated monuments, were made, and the line of a railroad, wagon road, or tramway located thereby or that actual construction was commenced on the line of any railroad, wagon road, or tramway, prior to January 21, 1898, the rights to inure hereunder shall, if the terms of this act are complied with as to such railroad, wagon road, or tramway, relate back to the date when such survey or construction was commenced; and in all conflicts relative to the right of way or other privilege of this act the person, company, or corporation having been first in time in actual survey or construction, as the case may be, shall be deemed first in right.

SEC. 9. That the map and profile of definite location of such railroad, wagon road, or tramway, to be filed as hereinbefore provided, shall, when the line passes over surveyed lands, indicate the location of the road by reference to section or other established survey corners, and where such line passes over unsurveyed lands the location thereon shall be indicated by courses and distances and by references to natural objects and permanent monuments in such manner that the location of the road may be readily determined by reference to descriptions given in connection with said profile map.

SEC. 10. That any citizen of the United States 21 years of age, or any association of such citizens, or any corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory now authorized by law to hold lands in the Territories, hereafter in the possession of and occupying public lands in the District of Alaska in good faith for the purposes of trade, manufacture, or other productive industry, may each purchase one claim only not exceeding 80 acres of such land for any one person, association, or corporation, at \$2.50 per acre, upon submission of proof that said area embraces improvements of the claimant and is needed in the prosecution of such trade, manufacture, or other productive industry, such tract of land not to include mineral or coal lands, and ingress and egress shall be reserved to the public on the waters of all streams, whether navigable or otherwise: *Provided*, That no entry shall be allowed under this act on lands abutting on navigable water of more than 80 rods: *Provided further*, That there shall be reserved by the United States a space of 80 rods in width between tracts sold or entered under the provisions of this act on lands abutting on any navigable stream, inlet, gulf, bay, or seashore, and that the Secretary of the Interior may grant the use of such reserved lands abutting on the water front to any citizen or association of citizens, or to any corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or under the laws of any State or Territory, for landings and wharves, with the provision that the public shall have access to and proper use of such wharves and landings at reasonable rates of toll, to be prescribed by said Secretary, and a roadway 60 feet in width, parallel to the shore line as near as may be practicable, shall be reserved for the use of the public as a highway: *Provided further*, That in case more than one person, association, or corporation shall claim the same tract of land, the person, association, or corporation having the prior claim, by reason of actual possession and continued occupation in good faith, shall be entitled to purchase the same, but where several persons are or may be so possessed of parts of the tract applied for, the same shall be awarded to them according to their respective interests: *Provided further*, That all claims substantially square in form and lawfully initi-

ated prior to January 21, 1898, by survey or otherwise, under sections 12 and 13 of the act approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stats. L., ch. 561), may be perfected and patented upon compliance with the provisions of said act, but subject to the requirements and provisions of this act, except as to area, but in no case shall such entry extend along the water front for more than 160 rods: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall reserve for the use of the natives of Alaska suitable tracts of land along the water front of any stream, inlet, bay, or seashore for landing places for canoes and other craft used by such natives: *Provided*, That the Annette, Pribilof Islands, and the islands leased or occupied for the propagation of foxes be excepted from the operation of this act.

That all affidavits, testimony, proofs, and other papers provided for by this act and by said act of March 3, 1891, or by any departmental or Executive regulation thereunder, by depositions or otherwise, under commission from the register and receiver of the land office, which may have been or may hereafter be taken and sworn to anywhere in the United States, before any court, judge, or other officer authorized by law to administer an oath, shall be admitted in evidence as if taken before the register and receiver of the proper local land office. And thereafter such proof, together with a certified copy of the field notes and plat of the survey of the claim, shall be filed in the office of the surveyor general of the District of Alaska, and if such survey and plat shall be approved by him, certified copies thereof, together with the claimant's application to purchase, shall be filed in the United States land office in the land district in which the claim is situated, whereupon, at the expense of the claimant, the register of such land office shall cause notice of such application to be published for at least 60 days in a newspaper of general circulation published nearest the claim within the District of Alaska, and the applicant shall at the time of filing such field notes, plat, and application to purchase in the land office, as aforesaid, cause a copy of such plat, together with the application to purchase, to be posted upon the claim, and such plat and application shall be kept posted in a conspicuous place on such claim continuously for at least 60 days, and during such period of posting and publication or within 30 days thereafter any person, corporation, or association having or asserting any adverse interest in or claim to the tract of land or any part thereof sought to be purchased may file in the land office where such application is pending, under oath, an adverse claim setting forth the nature and extent thereof, and such adverse claimant shall, within 60 days after the filing of such adverse claim, begin action to quiet title in a court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Alaska, and thereafter no patent shall issue for such claim until the final adjudication of the rights of the parties, and such patent shall then be issued in conformity with the final decree of the court.

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may cause to be appraised the timber or any part thereof upon public lands in the District of Alaska, and may from time to time sell so much thereof as he may deem proper for not less than the appraised value thereof, in such quantities to each purchaser as he shall prescribe, to be used in the District of Alaska, but not for export therefrom. And such sales shall at all times be limited to actual necessities for consumption in the District from year to year, and payments for such timber shall be made to the receiver of public moneys of the local land office of the land district in which said timber may be sold, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and the moneys arising therefrom shall be accounted for by the receiver of such land office to the Commissioner of the General Land Office in a separate account, and shall be covered into the Treasury. The Secretary of the Interior may permit, under regulations to be prescribed by him, the use of timber found upon the public lands in said District of Alaska by actual settlers, residents, individual miners, and prospectors for minerals, for firewood, fencing, buildings, mining, prospecting, and for domestic purposes, as may actually be needed by such persons for such purposes.

SEC. 12. That the President is authorized and empowered, in his discretion, by Executive order from time to time to establish or discontinue land districts in the District of Alaska, and to define, modify, or change the boundaries thereof, and designate or change the location of any land office therein; and he is also authorized and empowered to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a register for each land district he may establish and a receiver of public moneys therefor; and the register and receiver appointed for such district shall, during their respective terms of office, reside at the place designated for the land office. That the registers and receivers of public moneys in the land districts of Alaska shall each receive an annual salary of \$1,500 and the fees provided by law for like officers in the State of Oregon, not to exceed, including such salary and fees, a total annual compensation of \$3,000 for each of said officers.

SEC. 13. That native-born citizens of the Dominion of Canada shall be accorded in said District of Alaska the same mining rights and privileges accorded to citizens of the United States in British Columbia and the Northwest Territory by the laws of the Dominion of Canada or the local laws, rules, and regulations; but no greater rights shall be thus accorded than citizens of the United States or persons who have declared their intention to become such may enjoy in said District of Alaska; and the Secretary of the Interior shall from time to time promulgate and enforce rules and regulations to carry this provision into effect.

SEC. 14. That under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the privilege of entering goods, wares, and merchandise in bond or of placing them in bonded warehouses at any of the ports in the District of Alaska, and of withdrawing the same for exportation to any place in British Columbia or the Northwest Territory without payment of duty, is hereby granted to the Government of the Dominion of Canada and its citizens or citizens of the United States and to persons who have declared their intention to become such whenever and so long as it shall appear to the satisfaction of the President of the United States, who shall ascertain and declare the fact by proclamation, that corresponding privileges have been and are being granted by the Government of the Dominion of Canada in respect of goods, wares, and merchandise passing through the territory of the Dominion of Canada to any point in the District of Alaska from any point in said District.

Approved, May 14, 1898.

[Public, No. 168.]

An act to extend the coal-land laws to the District of Alaska.

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the public-land laws of the United States are hereby extended to the District of Alaska as relate to coal lands, namely, sections 2347 to 2352, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes. Approved, June 6, 1900.

[Public, No. 204.]

An act to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the coal-land laws to the District of Alaska," approved June 6, 1900.

Be it enacted, etc., That any person or association of persons qualified to make entry under the coal-land laws of the United States, who shall have opened or improved a coal mine or coal mines on any of the unsurveyed public lands of the United States in the District of Alaska, may locate the lands upon which such mine or mines are situated, in rectangular tracts containing 40, 80, or 160 acres, with north and south boundary lines run according to the true meridian, by marking the four corners thereof with permanent monuments, so that the boundaries thereof may be readily and easily traced. And all such locators shall, within one year from the passage of this act, or within one year from making such location, file for record in the recording district, and with the register and receiver of the land district in which the lands are located or situated, a notice containing the name or names of the locator or locators, the date of the location, the description of the lands located, and a reference to such natural objects or permanent monuments as will readily identify the same.

SEC. 2. That such locator or locators, or their assigns, who are citizens of the United States, shall receive a patent to the lands located by presenting, at any time within three years from the date of such notice, to the register and receiver of the land district in which the lands so located are situated an application therefor, accompanied by a certified copy of a plat of survey and field notes thereof, made by a United States deputy surveyor or a United States mineral surveyor duly approved by the surveyor general for the District of Alaska, and a payment of the sum of \$10 per acre for the lands applied for; but no such application shall be allowed until after the applicant has caused a notice of the presentation thereof, embracing a description of the lands, to have been published in a newspaper in the District of Alaska published nearest the location of the premises for a period of 60 days, and shall have caused copies of such notice, together with a certified copy of the official plat or survey, to have been kept posted in a conspicuous place upon the land applied for and in the land office for the district in which the lands are located for a like period, and until after he shall have furnished proof of such publication and posting, and such other proof as is required by the coal-land laws: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to authorize entries to be made or title to be acquired to the shore of any navigable waters within said district.

SEC. 3. That during such period of posting and publication, or within six months thereafter, any person or association of persons having or asserting any adverse interest or claim to the tract of land or any part thereof sought to be purchased shall file in the land office where such application is pending, under oath, an adverse claim, setting forth the nature and extent thereof, and such adverse claimant shall, within 60 days after the filing of such adverse claim, begin an action to quiet title in a court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Alaska, and thereafter no patent shall issue for such claim until the final adjudication of the rights of the parties, and such patent shall then be issued in conformity with the final decree of such court therein.

SEC. 4. That all the provisions of the coal-land laws of the United States not in conflict with the provisions of this act shall continue and be in full force in the District of Alaska.

Approved, April 28, 1904.

[Public, No. 151; S. 6805.]

An act to encourage the development of coal deposits in the Territory of Alaska.

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons, their heirs or assigns, who have in good faith personally or by an attorney in fact made locations of coal land in the Territory of Alaska in their own interest, prior to November 12, 1906, or in accordance with circular of instructions issued by the Secretary of the Interior May 10, 1907, may consolidate their said claims or locations by including in a single claim, location, or purchase not to exceed 2,560 acres of contiguous lands, not exceeding in length twice the width of the tract thus consolidated; and for this purpose such persons, their heirs or assigns, may form associations or corporations, who may perfect entry of and acquire title to such lands in accordance with all other provisions of law under which said locations were originally made: *Provided*, That no corporation shall be permitted to consolidate its claims under this act unless 75 per cent of its stock shall be held by persons qualified to enter coal lands in Alaska.

SEC. 2. That the United States shall at all times have the preference right to purchase so much of the product of any mine or mines opened upon the lands sold under the provisions of this act as may be necessary for the use of the Army and Navy, and at such reasonable and remunerative price as may be fixed by the President; but the producers of any coal so purchased who may be dissatisfied with the price thus fixed shall have the right to prosecute suits against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of any additional sum or sums they may claim as justly due upon such purchase.

SEC. 3. That if any of the lands or deposits purchased under the provisions of this act shall be owned, leased, trusted, possessed, or controlled by any device permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever so that they form part of or in any way effect any combination, or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, mortgage, stock ownership, or control, in excess of 2,560 acres in the District of Alaska, the title thereto shall be forfeited to the United States by proceedings instituted by the Attorney General of the United States in the courts for that purpose.

SEC. 4. That every patent issued under this act shall expressly recite the terms and conditions prescribed in sections 2 and 3 hereof.

Approved, May 28, 1908.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have dwelt briefly upon the opinions which Senators and Members of the House of Representatives formerly entertained with reference to Alaska, and I may say that the same opinion expressed by the minority when the bill for the payment of the purchase price was before the House of Representatives in 1868 is entertained by Members of the House to-day. I presume it would not be inappropriate for me to call the attention of the Senate to the report of the minority of the committee in the House of Representatives on a very similar bill in the House during this Congress, because while

we have knowledge upon the subject it does seem to me the minority report shows almost as entire a lack of comprehension of the subject for some reason or other as does the minority report printed nearly 50 years ago.

I have had furnished me by the Geological Survey a map, which is now hanging upon the wall of the Senate Chamber, which shows Alaska, and which may be consulted in connection with the subject which I propose to discuss.

Seattle is 400 miles nearer to Eastport, Me., the easternmost point of the United States, than to Attu, the extreme western point of Alaska. The meridian of longitude passing through Attu also passes through New Zealand.

The coast line is 26,000 miles long. On the south coast there are numerous deep, land-locked, ice-free harbors.

The total length of the navigable rivers is 6,000 miles. One of these, the Yukon, is 1,500 miles long from the mouth to the Canadian boundary and is navigable by large steamers for 500 miles above that point. It drains an area of 200,000 square miles.

Alaska has an area of 570,390 square miles, of which 100,000 square miles are susceptible of agricultural use, tillage, and grazing. Probably 30,000 square miles, or 5 per cent of the total area, can be made available for tillage farming.

Four-fifths of the possible tillable area is in the Central Plateau, of which the Tanana Valley offers the largest opportunities for farming. The Cook Inlet region has 3,000 square miles of tillable land, the Copper River drainage 2,000 square miles, and there are 1,000 square miles on the south coast, including the southeastern and southwestern projections.

It is not to be understood that the land in these areas is of such character that every half section is a possible farm home. Excepting in the alluvial-deposit areas bordering the larger streams, the topography of the tillable land is hilly, and in selecting homesteads care must be taken to secure a favorable slope, so as to get the full advantage of exposure to the sun. Apart from the bottom land there are few half sections all of which may be tilled, and homesteads will not be joined one to another, as a rule, but will be separated by land unfit for farming.

Alaskan soils have been formed largely from material produced by glacial action and from alluvial deposits. Gravels occur frequently, and these are often thinly covered with soil. Shallow lakes and lake beds abound, and in these latter the accumulation of partially decayed vegetation has been transformed into peat. Where the vegetation has fully decayed there is a rich black loam.

Because of the protecting coat of vegetation and the short melting season, the frost line in the soil lowers only a few feet during the summer, thus preventing the escape of the excess of soil moisture and, together with the low temperature, the decay of vegetation. This results in a very wet, mucky, and sour condition of the soil. Consequently much of the land, before it can be made to produce tillage crops, must be drained and cleared of the protecting coat of moss and other vegetation in order to permit the heat of the sun to lower the frost line. Lime is very generally needed as a corrective of the acidity of the soil.

Practically all of the tillable land in Alaska must be cleared of a timber growth and of moss, at heavy cost.

The climate of Alaska varies greatly. Now, this is what I want to call the attention of the Senate to, because I think people generally are uninformed as to climatic conditions in Alaska. On the south coast the summers are cool and the winters mild, the mean annual temperature at Sitka being about that of Washington, D. C. Zero temperatures are the exception. Precipitation is heavy, and there is much cloudy weather that is not favorable to tillage farming, other than the growing of vegetables and grasses. The high mountains fronting the south coast intercept the moisture-laden clouds coming from the sea and cause the excessive precipitation at low levels and the permanent snow and ice fields at the higher levels.

The central plateau, consequently, has a much drier climate and a much greater range of temperature, with warmer summers and colder winters. The summers are short as to number of days, but with 18 to 20 hours of sunshine in each 24 hours during the growing season vegetation develops very rapidly. The winter temperatures are very low, but with dry, still air and clear weather much of the time, particularly in the upper portion of the Yukon drainage.

Mr. President, I want to call attention briefly to the climatic and geographic conditions of Alaska, because, as I have already said, there is an opinion prevalent when Alaska is mentioned that it is of the Arctic region, and that we are not thinking of

it in any other light than as a barren, frozen wilderness. I am going to call attention to a summary of the report on the Alaskan agricultural possibilities, and incidentally as to its climate and its geography.

Mr. President, I want to compare the climate of Alaska with the climate of other countries in the same latitude on the Continent of Europe, and in this connection to show the population and the production of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Russian Provinces of Archangel, Vologda, and Olonetz, on the Continent. All these latter countries lie between latitudes 58° and 70° north, and for the most part they are north of 60°, the approximate latitude of the northern reach of the Gulf of Alaska, so that they are practically in exactly the same latitude.

In Europe, within the above limits, are embraced over 985,000 square miles, or about 599,450,000 acres. Alaska, with its 570,390 square miles, or 365,049,000 acres, extends from latitude 54° 30', in southeastern Alaska, to beyond 71° at Point Barrow, the farthest point north in Alaska. A study of the topography, climate, native plants, and so forth, shows that the conditions are not materially or essentially different in the two regions, whatever advantage there is in climate being probably slightly in favor of the European countries. In these countries of Europe more than 11,000,000 people are living, while the census of 1910 reports 64,356 as the population of Alaska, which seems to be an astounding comparison when it is taken into consideration that the European countries I have named are almost in exactly the same latitude, with conditions almost exactly the same.

Recent statistics show in the three countries and three Provinces in Europe which lie mostly north of 60° that 8,373,000 acres of land were producing cereals of all kinds, the total yield being: Wheat, 6,683,840 bushels; rye, 36,509,640 bushels; barley, 26,963,545 bushels; oats, 109,036,780 bushels. In addition, potatoes to the amount of 100,321,190 bushels and 7,871,119 tons of hay were reported. Live stock are returned for these countries as follows: Horses, 1,516,251; cattle, 6,110,476; sheep, 4,033,578; hogs, 1,484,124; goats, 368,021; and reindeer, 564,732.

The area reported under cultivation varies from less than 0.01 per cent in Archangel and 0.5 per cent in Norway to 4.1 per cent in Sweden. In Finland, Vologda, and Olonetz only about 1 per cent of the total area is in cultivation, as the term is commonly used. In nearly every country there are natural meadows of large extent used as pasture and for haymaking, so that the total under agricultural use is probably about double the figures quoted above. On a basis of 1 per cent of the total area available for crops and 2 per cent for crops, pasture, and haying there should be over 3,650,000 acres capable of cultivation, or 7,300,000 acres available for possible agricultural development in Alaska, pretty nearly as large as the area of the continent. In 1894 the Director of the United States Geological Survey, in a letter to the House Committee on Agriculture, estimated the area of tillable land in southeastern Alaska in the Cook Inlet country, the Alaskan Peninsula, and adjacent islands at from 3,000 to 5,000 square miles, or 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 acres. In 1900, after traveling repeatedly throughout Alaska and comparing estimates from various sources, Prof. C. C. Georgeson estimated the tillable and pasture land of Alaska at 100,000 square miles, or 64,000,000 acres. In 1910 Mr. J. W. Neal, who is in charge of the agricultural experiment station near Fairbanks, made a reconnaissance survey of the Tanana Valley, and he estimated the agricultural and grazing lands of that valley and the small valleys leading from it as about 15,000 square miles, or 9,700,000 acres, or more than the total area reported under crops in the specified countries of Europe.

With the same development of agriculture in Alaska as in Europe to supplement its mining, fisheries, and other industries, Alaska should support a population almost equal to that of Europe north of 60° latitude and a commerce of equal or greater importance.

I ask, Mr. President, that I may have printed as a part of my remarks the comparative area of the European countries with the latitude, the population, the total area, and the area cultivated in cereals, so that it may be used as a basis of comparison with reference to Alaska itself.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if he means that he desires the matter printed in words, rather than in map form?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not care to have it printed in map form, but simply in the form of a compilation of figures; that is all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission to do so will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Cooperative area of some European countries.

	Latitude north.	Population.	Total area.	Area cultivated to cereals.		
				Acres.	Acres.	Per cent.
Norway.....	58° 30' to 70° 30'	2,000,917	76,226,000	402,000		0.5
Sweden.....	56° 30' to 68°	4,919,260	101,563,000	4,113,900		4.1
Finland.....	60° to 70°	2,335,916	82,025,000	1,578,300		1.9
Russian Provinces:						
Archangel.....	62° to 70°	413,500	208,680,320	162,200		.075
Vologda.....	58° to 65°	1,565,800	99,369,600	1,656,930		1.7
Olonetz.....	60° to 64° 30'	422,200	31,587,200	359,770		1.1

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I also desire to have printed the crop production in the same European countries, to which I have called attention, and which are in the same latitude as Alaska, during the several years beginning in 1905; and also the amount of live stock in those same countries in Europe for a period covering the years from 1906 to 1908.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Crop production in some European countries.

	Wheat.	Rye.	Barley.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.
Norway (1905).....	318,880	951,360	3,357,120
Sweden (1905).....	5,769,520	16,929,120	13,134,000
Finland (1907).....	147,000	11,661,000	5,415,000
Russian Provinces:			
Archangel (1909).....	5,700	451,940	1,395,250
Vologda (1909).....	431,640	5,037,700	3,053,400
Olonetz (1909).....	11,100	1,478,520	608,771

	Oats.	Potatoes.	Hay.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Tons.
Norway (1905).....	9,562,880	25,033,400	2,572,920
Sweden (1905).....	65,646,860	50,654,730	3,361,390
Finland (1907).....	21,822,000	19,836,000	
Russian Provinces:			
Archangel (1909).....	226,200	752,880	295,153
Vologda (1909).....	9,567,110	2,923,140	1,216,482
Olonetz (1909).....	2,211,730	1,121,040	425,174

Live stock in certain European countries.

	Horses.	Cattle.	Sheep.
Norway (1906).....	172,468	1,094,101	1,333,488
Sweden (1906).....	566,227	2,628,982	1,021,727
Finland (1906).....	327,817	1,491,264	904,447
Russian Provinces:			
Archangel (1908).....	62,050	118,675	133,096
Vologda (1908).....	313,872	622,619	464,138
Olonetz (1908).....	73,817	154,835	116,682

	Hogs.	Goats.	Reindeer.
Norway (1906).....	318,556	296,442	142,623
Sweden (1906).....	878,828	65,300	288,360
Finland (1906).....	221,072	6,279	133,749
Russian Provinces:			
Archangel (1908).....	253		
Vologda (1908).....	60,957		
Olonetz (1908).....	4,458		

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, because of the fact that Alaska is so little understood in so far as its agricultural resources are concerned, I am going to call attention to certain annual reports of Prof. C. C. Georgeson, special agent in charge of the Alaska agricultural experiment stations, to the Secretary of Agriculture, because I really believe that if the agricultural possibilities and the transportation situation of Alaska were thoroughly understood by the Senate, if Senators would give the subject the attention that some of the Senators who are on the Committee on Territories have done, they would be entirely satisfied as to the possibility of developing Alaska from an agricultural as well as from every other standpoint, if proper transportation facilities were afforded.

I want to say right in this connection—for I am going to discuss the transportation matter at length a little later on—that no man who has ever been in Alaska as a representative of the

Government, so far as I have been able to ascertain, whether from the Agricultural Department or from the Geological Survey, or whether we take the report of the Alaska Railway Commission—every one of them has come back to Congress and suggested, by reports and otherwise, the impossibility of the development of that country without the construction of railroads, and many of them have suggested that this construction ought to be undertaken by the Government.

Now, note that in his report for 1907, which I am about to read, Prof. Georgeson, who, as I have said, is special agent in charge of the Alaska agricultural experiment stations, as a representative of the Agricultural Department, says, at page 20:

It is self-evident that the interior of Alaska can not be settled by the class of people best suited to exploit and develop the latent agricultural capacity when it costs from \$200 to \$500 to move a ton of freight 100 miles inland from the port of debarkation, or more, in proportion to distance; when a seat in the stage from Valdez to Fairbanks costs \$150 and meals and sleeping quarters from \$5 to \$10 a day in addition; when sugar, salt, oatmeal, and other equally plain articles are 25 cents a pound, bacon 40 to 60 cents a pound, condensed milk 75 cents a can, and everything else in proportion. Only people with money, or at least with an assured income, can meet these conditions. The chief assets of pioneer farmers are a vigorous constitution and indomitable courage, but these alone will not pay freight, move families, procure equipments, or buy provisions. The class of people who homestead land do not as a rule have much money, and, taking into account the expenses which homesteaders in Alaska must incur, comparatively few can come here. Corporations and trading companies are not in business for philanthropic purposes; it is useless to look to them for reductions to settlers, although such a step would result to their advantage, since an increase in population would mean an increase in business. The Government alone can remedy these economic conditions, and it can do it by liberal encouragement of railroad building.

That was in 1907, before the railroad commission was appointed and before President Taft or President Wilson or any of these distinguished gentlemen had discussed the subject in messages or otherwise.

Alaska is a large country. It will take at least three trunk lines to open up the valleys of the Copper, the Yukon, the Sushitna, and Kuskokwim. The building of wagon roads, which the Government has begun, will prove of great benefit to the country. Improved transportation facilities are Alaska's greatest need. When these are provided the economic conditions which now bar settlement will gradually right themselves. Competition will bring down prices and the cost of living. Labor will be more plentiful; mines which it will not pay to work at present will be opened; resources now untouched will be exploited; business will increase; markets for farm produce will develop, and the country will be settled. Without improved transportation facilities the country will remain stagnant; only the richest mines can be worked, and the country will be deserted when these are exhausted.

In that same connection he discusses—and I intend to read what he says—the agricultural possibilities up there as disclosed by the experiment stations in Alaska.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not kept in very close touch with the development of Alaska, although my sympathies are very strongly in the direction of doing all that we can for that great country. Will the Senator kindly state for my information how many miles of railroad there are now in Alaska?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I intended to take that up in regular order. I think it is something more than 500 miles. I will call attention in a few moments to the lines that are established to show how far apart they are, so as to show that they really do not develop the country nor supply its needs for transportation.

Mr. GALLINGER. What I was really in search of was information as to whether those lines of railway were built entirely by private capital?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Entirely so; yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. A further question which suggests itself to my mind is, May we not, without actually going into the matter of building railroads by the Government, adopt some policy of granting lands or other subsidies to private corporations to build those roads? Has that been considered or discussed?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That has been considered; and I will say to the Senator that I am going to show a little further on that that has been the policy of this Government, not only in the development of the West and of the South, but practically in the development of the Philippines. The situation in Alaska, however, is sui generis. There is a country of vast possibilities, one-fifth as large as the whole continental country of the United States, 99 per cent of which is still owned by the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has appealed to me very strongly in this connection that, as a matter of fact, the Government owns almost the entire Territory of Alaska.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Absolutely.

Mr. GALLINGER. And that is about the only argument that has yet appealed to me in behalf of the Government building railroads in that Territory. I have been interested in seeing

what Canada is doing in the matter of railroad building. She is, I suppose with some aid from the Imperial Government, constructing a great transcontinental line now from the Atlantic to the Pacific far north of the Canadian Pacific, through what has heretofore been an almost untrod wilderness.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir. Canada aids her railroads.

Mr. GALLINGER. And I have wondered whether some similar policy might not be adopted here which would relieve us from the necessity of going into Government ownership of railroads. I will say to the Senator—I have had a little private conversation with him for a few moments on this subject—that my mind is not foreclosed against this bill. I want very much to listen to the Senator, and hope I will be permitted to do so in his discussion of the question.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, I am, as all Senators are, subject to be called out of the Chamber, when we can not refuse to go, but I very much want to hear the Senator's views on this very important subject.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the Senator; and in connection with what the Senator has just said, I want to say that I intend to show a little later, in considering the efforts that this country has made and the policy it has adopted in the development of the western country, that the mammoth grants which have been made to the railroad companies have been really disastrous to our country, and that, too, when the United States itself did not own the adjacent territory, which was largely in the hands of individuals. Alaska, however, has received no support or assistance from the Government, except in the way of constructing trails and wagon roads. The United States owns all of its resources, and, as a business proposition, if for nothing else, the United States ought to develop its own property for the benefit of its own people.

Mr. GALLINGER. In that connection, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I will ask the Senator, who possesses a knowledge which I do not on this point, except as I read, is it not a fact that Canada is doing very much more for her northwestern territory, adjoining Alaska, than the United States has done for Alaska?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is no doubt about that. Right there in that connection, Mr. President, I will say that there has been great complaint made, as the Senator knows, about our people going up into Saskatchewan, into Alberta, into Manitoba, and into other Canadian Provinces. The reason for that is that Canada is inviting through the instrumentality of her assisted railroads people into that country, while the United States, with just as fine a country immediately adjoining the Canadian Provinces, is absolutely neglecting everything that would tend to its development. If the United States would put forth half the energy that has been put forth in Canada for the development of her railways, we would find Alaska and its hundred thousand square miles of tillable area immediately settled by people of this country who are seeking an outlet, who are seeking homes, and who would be glad to have an opportunity to go there.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. The suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] opens up a very interesting retrospect. I should like the Senator's opinion upon this proposition: Would it not have been easier for the United States to have built every railroad to which a land grant has been given and transferred the completed property, without any compensation at all, than to have pursued the course we actually did pursue, namely, giving them great empires of land, which have turned out to be exceedingly valuable?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is no doubt about that, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope we will not pursue that plan in Alaska. I myself would rather have the Government build the railroads there and give them away, if we do not care to operate them, than to give to private companies resources the value of which in the future will be almost beyond computation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that I intend to address myself to the policies which the United States has heretofore adopted with reference to railroad assistance, and he will find from the showing which I hope I shall be able to make that the United States might well have built all the railroads that it has assisted, given them over to the companies that built them, and have made money in the retention of the grants that were made, but I will call attention to that a little later on. I do not want to take up that question until I submit the question of the agricultural resources of Alaska, be-

cause, in the final analysis, much of the development of Alaska, rich as it is in mineral resources, will depend upon its possibilities of agricultural development.

Prof. Georgeson, who is a Dane, I believe, born in a country that is in almost the same latitude as Alaska, who has been up in Alaska for 8 or 10 years and who knows the conditions in his own country and in Alaska, representing the Agricultural Department, in his report of 1908, at page 8—I merely want to call attention briefly to this, for these reports are very interesting, because they discuss all of the different aspects of the possibilities of Alaska—says:

A few things have been demonstrated beyond a peradventure.

I might add here that evidence before some of the committees shows that, generally, where Norwegians or Swedes or Scandinavians go up into the Alaskan country and settle, they commence to make money as soon as they take up the land. Why? Because they understand the conditions, while an American settler who goes up there and undertakes to make money has first to become acclimated and to learn the conditions which prevail in that latitude.

A few things have been demonstrated beyond a peradventure. Perhaps the most important fact proved is that Alaska is an agricultural country. It is but a short time since this claim was discredited and treated with ridicule.

And it is treated with ridicule now, Mr. President, in many quarters.

Another fact that has been proved is that cattle feed can be produced in any quantity; that is to say, while grains may be injured by frost in certain regions, they can always be grown to a stage at which they will make nutritious hay, and the native grasses can maintain live stock in excellent condition in summer, and they make good hay and silage for winter feed. Indeed, the silage from one species of grass, beach rye (*Elymus mollis*), proved on analysis to be equal to clover hay in nutritive qualities. Potatoes, cabbage, cauliflower, rhubarb, turnips, lettuce, and, in short, all the hardy vegetables can be grown to perfection up to and even within the Arctic Circle, as has been proved by thousands of settlers.

A legitimate question, and one which is frequently asked, is: Why, in view of the productive capacity of the country and with the prevailing high prices for farm produce, is Alaska not rapidly settled with farmers? The answer is that the economic conditions prevent settlement. Alaska can not be settled before railroads and wagon roads are built and transportation rates are reduced. Under present conditions but few farmers can afford to go to Alaska with their families, live stock, and equipment. The expense would equal the cost of a farm in the States.

The question of development always goes back to that question, Mr. President—the want of railroad facilities—because no man can move his family into that country and afterwards move the necessary supplies in there unless he is a man of independent means and fortune, and every one of the agents of the Government, no matter from what department, comes to the same conclusion, that the economic conditions in Alaska prevent settlement and development.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. What is the condition of those agricultural lands with reference to being inside of a forest reserve or outside of it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Well, I said a little while ago, before the Senator came in, that practically everything in Alaska is withdrawn; so that with a good homestead law and a good coal law it is impossible for men to go there and settle. That is one of the economic conditions that has been brought about in part by these reservations.

Mr. BORAH. I only wish to say that we have in the United States proper a vast amount of land very close to the railroads which has not been settled and will not be settled very quickly, but it is not by reason of a lack of railroad facilities. While I am thoroughly in sympathy with the view which the Senator is entertaining and expressing with reference to the necessity of transportation facilities in Alaska, there will have to be something else to stop the settlers of this country from going into Canada besides railroads.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the Senator is right, but I want to say that the Senator and I might disagree very radically about the propriety of the withdrawals in Alaska. I do not think President Roosevelt ever did anything that I approved of more heartily than his withdrawals in Alaska, because the conditions, as developed by the evidence that has been taken before both the Senate and the House committees, disclose that if President Roosevelt had not made those withdrawals in the first place, with the three or four gateways and the open ports in Alaska in the possession of the Alaskan Syndicate, every coal mine in Alaska would probably have been acquired by the same syndicate; every copper mine would have been secured, as now the most valuable copper mines are owned, by this particular syndicate; so that the only way of preserving that magnificent

Territory and saving its resources for the people of the United States hereafter was to withdraw it at that time.

Mr. BORAH. I am not criticizing Col. Roosevelt for anything that he did, especially for these withdrawals, but there ought to be a time when the Government could disclose sufficient virility in the way of legislation and statesmanship to open up to the people these lands, which were withdrawn in order that the people might get the benefit of them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am in hearty accord with the Senator; but, as the Senator knows, as I know, and as the western people generally know, Alaska has been knocking at the doors of Congress for the last 15 years, asking for the enactment of some laws that would be practical for the development of her coal mines and to protect those mines from monopolistic control; but Congress has not done anything. Congress has practically refused to do anything. The Delegate from Alaska ever since he has been here has had some bill for the relief of Alaska, seeking to have some safe and sane legislation adopted for the development of the mineral resources of that country; and yet we have not done anything.

Mr. BORAH. That is just exactly what I understand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I had understood that the coal lands in Alaska had been withdrawn and that some iceberg lands up there had been put into forest reserves; but do I understand the Senator to say that metalliferous lands have been withdrawn?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Practically.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then the lands which are supposed to contain deposits of gold—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is safe to say to the Senator that practically everything has been withdrawn.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not finished—that lands containing, or supposed to contain, deposits of gold and deposits of copper have been withdrawn from the prospector?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think they have within the reserves.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator approve of that? Does the Senator approve of withdrawing from the prospector lands supposed to contain precious and other metals?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned I do not approve of wholesale withdrawals, except in the particular emergency to which I have referred, because it was the only way to save the resources of Alaska to the people.

Now, I will call the Senator's attention to one thing, and then he will understand what I mean. If the Senator will take the trouble to look into the record, he will find that the Alaska syndicate built the Cordova & Northwestern Railroad up to its copper mine at Kennicott. After it had done that and had acquired the control of the richest copper mines in Alaska, it turned its attention to the Bering coal fields; and there is a contract in evidence in the Ballinger investigation which shows that the representatives of the Guggenheim interests entered into a contract with the representatives of the Cunningham claimants for the purpose of acquiring the coal mines in the Bering River district. That is the reason I say I approve of these withdrawals. If they had not been made, the United States would not have any interest in developing that country by railroad or by any other instrumentality.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not saying anything about the withdrawal of the coal lands. I was simply speaking of the withdrawal of other lands. I venture to say to the Senator from Oregon that if that policy had been pursued from the beginning in this country California would not have become the great gold-producing State that it was; the silver mines of Nevada never would have been opened; the lead and copper and silver mines of Utah never would have been opened. The only way the great metalliferous mineral resources of this country have been developed has been through the prospector. If you expect any of the undeveloped part of this country to be developed in the same way, you have to give the prospector the opportunity to go into the lands and prospect them and then reap the benefit of what he discovers.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it is a thoroughly unwise policy to close any part of the country, either of the United States proper or of Alaska, against opportunity upon the part of the prospector to go in and discover these minerals.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have been waiting five years, ever since I came into the Senate, to hear some one discuss the very question that is now before us; and I should like to hear the Senator from Oregon about it, because I think we shall have to know something about it before we can proceed very far with the building of railroads in Alaska. That is, what kind of law do we need to admit the honest pioneer and developer of a country, and at the same time to exclude the men who, the Senator from Oregon says, in 1906 were about to get possession of the whole of Alaska?

I have never yet heard that question answered as it ought to be. The western Senators are all agreed that these resources ought to be at the disposal of the honest homesteader, the honest prospector, the honest lumberman, the honest miner; but what kind of law can we devise that will permit these men to have their rights, and at the same time will prevent the monopoly which was feared in 1906 with regard to Alaska?

I think the Senator from Oregon will render his country a very great service if he will enter upon the discussion of that question at some time before he finishes his address.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In answer to the Senator, I will say that I am not sure that there is any power in Congress or anywhere to prevent the monopolization and control of resources such as Alaska has.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I hardly agree with the last statement the Senator made, in respect to its being impossible to prevent monopolization of the resources of Alaska.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I had not quite finished.

Mr. SMOOT. For instance, I think it is possible to prevent it, as far as coal and oil lands are concerned, by a proper lease bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. As I say, I had not quite finished my answer when the Senator interrupted.

Mr. SMOOT. I have introduced a bill along that line; and I have also introduced a bill to-day allowing agricultural entries upon these mineral lands, so that their withdrawal will have no effect upon the men who want to farm them, but all that is under the surface will be retained in the possession of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. Before we pass this subject, in order that there shall be no confusion, I think a statement ought to be made which, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, I shall be glad to make.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. That is that there has been no withdrawal of land in Alaska anywhere affecting prospecting for metalliferous lodes or the prospecting of metal-bearing mineral lands. There are vast forest reserves there, naval reserves, military reserves, and fish reserves, most of which are along the shore. There are vast regions in the interior, in the Tanana-Yukon district, that are not within a forest reserve, and so in the Innoko-Iditarod district and in the Seward Peninsula. That is, there are great regions in Alaska that are open to exploration for the location of mineral claims other than coal which are not within forest reserves at all, and which are not within any reservations of any character. There is no difficulty at all, under the law, about going within even a forest reserve for the purpose of making location of mineral claims and the prospecting can go on just exactly the same. The only difficulty arises when the locator endeavors to make proof. He is then required to satisfy the forest officials that the land is more valuable for the mineral than it is for the timber upon it. There are, however, these important withdrawals of coal lands, and that is the thing which really stands in the way.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to ask the Senator from Montana if he ever had any experience in trying to satisfy the Forestry Bureau as to what constituted a mineral discovery in a forest reserve?

Mr. WALSH. I must answer the Senator that I have had exactly the same embarrassing experience he has had. The trouble about it is that the prospector goes out there and he is entirely satisfied that he can make a mine of his claim, and the forest ranger is entirely satisfied that he is an idiot ever to at-

tempt it; and the recommendation of the ranger ordinarily goes against that of the prospector.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who addressed a question to me a while ago as to whether or not it would be possible to enact legislation which would protect these resources from monopolization, I do not believe Congress could pass any laws permitting the individual acquirement of title to the copper mines and the coal lands and the oil lands and resources of that kind and protect them from monopolistic control, because the history of legislation on the subject shows—and the courts have practically sustained that view of it—that an individual, after he acquires title to public lands in apparent good faith, may dispose of it as he will, and yet he may be acting for some great monopoly. No man can read the secrets of a corrupt and designing heart.

Take the Cunningham claims, for instance. I do not pretend to say of my own knowledge whether they were attempted to be fraudulently acquired or not; but it did develop in subsequent investigations that they had not gone very far toward the acquirement of title to those lands until the iron hand of the Alaska Syndicate displayed itself and this syndicate was contracting to acquire control of them. Then the Cordova & Northwestern Railroad, the creation of this same syndicate, was turned into the coal region covered by the Cunningham claims; so that while on the face of it the Cunningham claimants were acquiring title honestly—and maybe they were—yet before the title was complete they were selling it to a syndicate to whose interest it was to secure control of Alaska and everything in it.

I want to say that in my opinion the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is the correct solution of this problem—that so far as oil lands, coal lands, and resources of that kind are concerned, the Government ought to maintain the ownership and control of them and lease them to people who want to develop them.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The coal lands and oil lands in Alaska never can be developed without a vast amount of wealth and capital behind the development. If you prefer to withhold from them the title, and turn over the matter in the way of a lease, they will still have to have the vast amount of capital which is necessary in order to develop the lands. Individuals, people of limited means, can not go in there and develop the lands even under a lease. They have to depend on capital somewhere.

You are going to be up against the same proposition with reference to the development of coal lands and oil lands that you are with reference to building this railroad; that is, the Government has either got to permit the people who have the capital to go in there or the Government must do it itself. The Government will have to furnish the means and the capital to develop the lands and to work the mines, or it will have to permit people to go in there who have a vast amount of capital in order to do it.

You are finally coming to the same proposition with reference to that matter that you are with reference to the railroads, and that is that the Government itself will have to develop the coal mines and work them if the masses of the people are to get any benefit out of the development.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I differ very radically from the views of the Senator. As coal mines are worked now, in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred they are operated by lessees. The records will show that there is an extravagant waste in the operation of all the coal mines under the present leasing system, because the lessee can only develop the paying streaks and veins of coal. If, however, the United States owns this coal land and is the lessor, it, with the machinery of government behind it, can compel the use of the coal mines by the lessees in a way to protect the Government, properly conserve the same against waste, and at the same time furnish means of transportation which will justify a lessee in taking out the coal and shipping it to a market.

Mr. BORAH. The President can compel the man to work the mine to the satisfaction of the Government, and he can compel the man to timber the mine and work out all the portion of the mine which is workable at all. Undoubtedly he can compel the man to do that, but the ultimate consumer will pay for all of it. He will necessarily have to do so. If you are going to have standing between the consumer and the Government a lessee who has to be paid or else he will not be there, and to realize upon the proposition you are going to furnish the coal to the man who wants to burn it no cheaper

than if it had gone into the hands of capitalists in the first place and you had undertaken to regulate the monopoly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. States are leasing now—individuals are leasing now—and under arrangements which are entirely satisfactory.

Mr. BORAH. As to the last proposition, I disagree with the Senator. I never have been able to find a leasing system yet which has been in operation for any number of years, either in Australia or in any other part of the world, where corruption did not enter into the matter with reference to securing the leases, maintaining them, and working them, or where the expense did not become so great that the consumer received no benefit at all from the system.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. While I had not intended to refer to it, I have before me, and can show the Senator, a statement of the total coal production in the United States, the mines that are operated by the owners, the mines that are operated by lessees, and the whole situation. The Senator will find, if he will take the trouble to examine the evidence, that nearly all the coal mines are now operated by lessees. If the owner of a mine can lease it to an individual or to a corporation that can operate it at a profit, why can not the United States, which owns the land and which constructs a railroad and fixes the rates, enable a lessee to operate it to the same advantage as an individual?

Mr. BORAH. I presume I have examined the matters to which the Senator refers, as I have examined almost everything I could find upon the subject; but the Senator misunderstands my proposition. I have not any doubt that coal mines are being operated under a lease successfully, but who is paying for it? The price of coal demonstrates who is paying for it, the fact that the mines are being operated in that way.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is no question that the ultimate consumer pays it. He is paying it now.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. He is paying the rates that have been fixed by the Pennsylvania mines and the railroad companies, too.

Mr. BORAH. If the Government can not do anything more with reference to the coal mines of Alaska than to furnish coal to the consumers of the country at the same price they are paying now, the Government had better stay out of Alaska.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I predict that if the United States will build a railroad there and keep control of the coal fields, it will furnish coal cheaper than it is being furnished to the consumers of Pennsylvania coal or any other coal in this country.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. We ought to bear in mind, in discussing that phase of the matter, that about three-fourths, or at least two-thirds, of the cost of bituminous coal to the consumer consists in transportation. If we can save the consumer on the western coast the great cost of transportation we shall have greatly benefited him, even though it costs as much to take the coal from the mine in Alaska as it costs to take it elsewhere.

I have an idea that the principal benefit, or at least one of the great benefits, of opening up this region will be to reduce the cost of transportation of coal from distant points to the points of consumption on the Pacific coast.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; I will say that more than two-thirds of the cost of transportation of coal from the Pennsylvania mines to the Pacific coast, for the use of the Navy as well as for the use of the individual, is the cost of transportation.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should think it would be more than four-fifths of it; but two-thirds of the average cost of coal to the consumer is transportation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; there is no question about that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to direct an interrogatory more to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], perhaps, than to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Would it follow, if we leased these lands and furnished cheap transportation, that the consumer would get any benefit? Would not the consumer then be left practically to purchasing from one or two lessees; and as there would be no competition except that created by coal which had come from long distances and had paid large rates, would the consumer really get any benefit, even if we transport it more cheaply?

I am not trying to controvert; I am asking for light.

Mr. CUMMINS. I may be wrong about it, but I have assumed that there is room for more than one coal mine in

Alaska, and that competition of an effective character would be developed in Alaska, and that the miners or lessees there would compete with each other, and the coal would be sold from that point at a fair profit, considering cost of production and transportation. If the coal in Alaska for the supply of the western country is to be in the hands of a single producer—a monopoly—then, so far as I am concerned, I do not shrink from saying that the Government of the United States ought to produce it and sell it at a fair profit.

Mr. REED. I am not advised how many there are. The debate is new to me. I have been unable, because of other engagements, to give much attention to this bill, and I was asking for information.

I take it from the question of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that he is of the opinion that the Government itself ought to work the mines. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. The Senator from Missouri, it seems to me, has stated the proposition which we are going to meet, and it is this: There will be no more reason why lessees should compete than why owners should compete, and the consumer will not get any benefit from the development. The lessees will have the same open or secret understanding with reference to the matter, and by the time the coal gets to Seattle or San Francisco or Boise City, Idaho, we will not know whether the title is in the original party or whether it is in a lessee.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think the Government will have any trouble about controlling the price of coal where it owns the mines and owns the transportation as well, and has the power of fixing the terms of the lease as well as the rates of transportation. It will be regulated and controlled. There is not any question about that.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, it is easy to say that, Mr. President, but where has the Government ever regulated, in all its attempts to regulate, so that the price has really drifted down and benefited the consumer?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It seems to me that through the Interstate Commerce Commission the Government has regulated a very much more difficult situation in the transportation of this country.

Mr. BORAH. The Interstate Commerce Commission is a great commission, but the final benefits to the people are yet to be demonstrated.

Mr. CUMMINS. I can give the Senator an instance of coal being sold at a fair price. In my State—and we have more acres of coal land in that prairie State than there are in Pennsylvania—there is the sharpest competition between the producers of coal. The transportation charge is fixed by law, and the consumers of coal in Iowa get it at such a price as affords the producer but a fair profit. Indeed, oftentimes, and I think the greater part of the time, the producers of coal barely make a fair profit.

Mr. BORAH. Do the consumers of coal in Iowa get coal cheaper than they do across the river in Illinois?

Mr. CUMMINS. We get it cheaper. Our coal is not quite so good as the coal produced in Illinois.

Mr. BORAH. Naturally, I should think that if it were as good, and the question of quality did not enter into the question of competition, it would go across the river into Illinois.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; the cost of transporting coal is so great as compared with the value of the coal that unless you have a high quality that pays for long transportation coal is not transported over long distances.

Mr. BORAH. That is true; but then there are points in Illinois which are much closer to the coal fields in Iowa than certain parts of Iowa are to those coal fields.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes. The same coal that is mined in our State is practically all consumed in the State, and the territory that we can reach is controlled wholly by the cost of transportation. We get some Illinois coal. We get it, however, wholly because it is better coal and can be used successfully for some purposes for which our coal can not be used.

That, however, is not the point I have in mind. The point I have in mind is that we have sufficient competition among producers of coal in our State to insure its distribution to the consumers at a fair price, considering the cost of production and of transportation, and I see no reason why that should not be true in Alaska.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield; but really I should like to get through.

Mr. REED. I want to make just one remark. Of course that is the whole question. In the State of Iowa, as the Senator says, there is great competition, a vast body of coal, and a

large number of individual companies competing with each other. If that condition is assured in Alaska, of course that is one thing. If, however, the field is limited, if the opportunities for competition are small, or competition is not assured, that is another thing. Then I agree with the Senator who has the floor that, of course, the Government, in its leasing, might possibly protect against an unjust price. Certain it is, however, that by one means or another we ought, in passing this bill, to see to it that the ultimate consumer gets the benefit of a reasonable price.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I want to make just a suggestion. The Senator has signified his desire to go ahead and complete his speech, and I sympathize with his desire to do so, because we have consumed much of his time. I only wanted to say that I am not by any means antagonistic to the proposition which the Senator has before the Senate. My suggestion has only this in view, that if we are going to have these natural resources finally dedicated to the use of the people of the United States the Government can not stop with the mere building of the railroad; it will have to operate the mines and furnish the coal to the consumer.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to his colleague?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. LANE. I wish to say that in a general way I am in favor of this bill. I want to see the Government build a railroad into Alaska. As to leasing the property containing the coal veins, I have but little confidence in that method of mining coal, for the reason that I have been in mining countries in the past and I find that what the lessee of a mine does is this: He drives his tunnel, his shaft, or sinks his drift upon the very richest portion of the property, and immediately begins to exhaust that which pays him the most in the most rapid manner. In other words, as the miners say, he "guts" the mine. He does not timber for permanency. He timbers in a manner which will last through his lease, and only for that time. He skimps his timbering, and when his lease expires the owner of the mine must come in and reface his mine and start his works anew at a heavy expense. Sometimes it costs him more than he received from the lease. Unless it is very carefully safeguarded, it is a very dangerous proposition.

If I had a good coal vein, or if I owned a good vein of iron ore, or if I owned a good placer claim with a good, rich pay streak, I never would lease it out to any man. I would mine it myself, for the reason that I would keep my work in line and work the full width of my pay streak. If I should lease it to a man who was intent upon making a profit out of it, I know very well that he would follow the fattest, richest portion of the pay streak, and pay no attention to the rest of the mine, and when he got out of the mine I would have to face it up and start my work all over again.

I am therefore in favor of having the Government hold full control and absolute ownership of this coal and mine the coal itself; and if it can possibly be done, I shall offer an amendment to this bill to that effect. The Government will turn it over to no lessee to any great advantage to the people. They will fall down on that proposition as they have fallen down all along the line in everything in which they undertook to go into partnership with a private interest in the production of something which is for the use of the masses of the people of this country. In my opinion, it will not work.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I have wandered far afield from the proposition I was discussing, which was the agricultural possibilities of Alaska; but while I am addressing myself to the coal proposition, I wish to refer to the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho as to the impossibility of a Government relieving the ultimate consumer. As has been well stated by the Senator from Iowa, two-thirds or more of the cost of coal to the ultimate consumer is the transportation charge.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will yield in just a minute. I want to answer briefly the question which the Senator asked me.

Mr. BORAH. I thought the Senator had finished what he was going to say on that subject.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Government of the United States itself is a large consumer of coal in the Pacific, for the use of its fleet, during the present condition of things. I think the consumption of coal there now, before the completion of the Pan-

ama Canal, is something like 160,000 tons per annum. That coal is delivered on board of colliers, either at Norfolk or at Baltimore, at \$3 per ton. It is delivered to the Government of the United States at San Francisco at \$7.50 to \$8.25 per ton, and at practically the same price at Pearl Harbor, in Hawaii, and possibly at the same price in the Philippines. The exact rates are not material. Now, where does that cost come in? If the United States controlled the transportation situation between Baltimore or Norfolk and San Francisco or Pearl Harbor, why could not the United States fix its transportation charges to meet the demands of the ultimate consumer without loss and without excessive or any profit? If the coal mines in Alaska, and transportation facilities as well, are owned by the United States—and it must be remembered that the United States is not there for the purpose of making money—why can it not deliver coal to the ultimate consumer, either at San Francisco or Pearl Harbor or Manila, cheaper than it is possible for individuals to deliver it, whether the ultimate consumer happens to be the United States Navy or the individual citizen?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand the position of the Senator, it is that the cost of transportation is what makes coal so high to the consumers of this country.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It does in the West.

Mr. BORAH. Then if the other proposition which I stated a moment ago be true, and the Interstate Commerce Commission is effective in controlling the rates on railroads, why does not the Interstate Commerce Commission see that we get the benefit of a proper rate of transportation?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. We are not discussing that question right now. If you want a frank answer with reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission, I would say that Congress has been so unwise as to overload the commission to such a degree that it can not, except with untiring energy, half do its work now. But that does not have anything to do with this proposition. As a matter of fact the coal resources of Alaska are not being developed simply because, in the auriferous sections of Alaska, with coal at its very door and an abundance within 50 miles of the people who want it for domestic and other purposes, it is being brought in either from the East or from British Columbia at an almost prohibitive transportation cost. In other words, the possibility of development in Alaska is retarded simply because they have not any transportation facilities to use the coal of the Territory, even if it were released from the present reserves.

I had hoped that I would have been through with this discussion long before now, and I would have been through had not Senators interrupted me so much. However, I shall attempt to show later that not only are our rates prohibitive as to coal but are almost prohibitive as to everything that goes into or comes out of Alaska, and unless we can reach the coal no one can go there and undertake to develop its resources at any time or in any season of the year. But I want to get back again to the agricultural possibilities of Alaska, from which I have been diverted. I am dwelling on that particularly because, as I said in the outset, the early reports on Alaska were opposed to the view that there was a possibility of agricultural development in Alaska. There are men to-day—I have talked with them in Washington, Members of the House and the Senate—who say that Alaska is nothing but a refrigerating plant, and that there is nothing there to be developed. I know it is not maliciously said. It is simply said because persons have not given the subject any consideration. Here the Government of the United States has had its ablest men in Alaska from the Agricultural Department; it has had its ablest men from the Geological Survey; it has had its ablest men from every department of the Government studying the situation in Alaska from a scientific standpoint and on the ground, and we can safely be governed by reports made on the ground by persons who have no interest in magnifying the conditions or making things appear better than they are. So we must in the final analysis come back to the reports of these men.

I am going to ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the report of Dr. Walter H. Evans. I should like to read it to the Senate, but I am not going to do it, because of its length, and I assume that Senators are going to look over the statistics and give consideration to what I submit. Dr. Walter H. Evans is Chief of Insular Stations, Agricultural Department, and his report shows the results of actual experiments at four or five agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, at Rampart, Fairbanks, Kenai, and Kodiak, and at Copper Center, where the experiment station was finally abandoned for reasons which appeared good to the Agricultural

Department. I ask that this matter may be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The establishment of agricultural experiment stations in Alaska was the result of an appropriation of \$5,000 made by Congress for the fiscal year 1893, in which the Department of Agriculture was charged "with the investigation and report to Congress upon the agricultural resources and capabilities of Alaska, with special reference to the desirability and feasibility of the establishment of agricultural experiment stations in said Territory."

An investigation covering the summer of 1897 showed that there were decided indications of agricultural possibilities in that country when judged by the known conditions in northern Europe and the native and introduced vegetation, the presence of gardens, etc., in the regions visited. In 1898 headquarters were established at Sitka and work begun to determine the possibilities of agriculture in Alaska. Since then stations have been established on the island of Kodiak and at Kenai on the peninsula of that name, at Copper Center in the valley of the Copper River, and at Rampart and Fairbanks, representing the Yukon and Tanana Valleys. The reports of the work at all these points confirm the early belief that in many parts of Alaska agriculture can be practiced to a considerable extent.

On account of local or other considerations it has been thought advisable to divide the work according to what has appeared to be the most practical lines of investigation. At Sitka, representing southeastern Alaska, where large areas of level land are not available, horticultural work has been given prominence. At the Rampart and Fairbanks stations, where there are extensive tracts of land suitable to cultivation, grain growing has been given especial attention, supplementing it with trials of standard vegetable crops. At Kodiak, representing southwestern Alaska, where large areas of pasture lands are to be found, live-stock breeding has been given prominence. The stations at Kenai and Copper Center have been temporarily closed and the custody of the buildings and grounds turned over to the Bureau of Education of the Department of the Interior, owing to their isolation, the lack of development in those regions, and the inadequacy of the appropriations to cover so extensive an area with so small an allotment of funds.

As a result of the investigations at Sitka, Rampart, and Fairbanks, supplemented by hundreds of letters from settlers, it can be safely asserted that in almost any part of Alaska south of the Arctic Circle hardy vegetables of good quality can be produced, as far as the climate is concerned. A list of these vegetables would embrace radishes, turnips, kale, mustard, lettuce, carrots, parsnips, parsley, peas, cress, cabbage, cauliflower, Brussels sprouts, kohlrabi, onions, spinach, endive, leeks, beets, potatoes, and rhubarb, and among the herbs, caraway, catnip, mint, and thyme. In specially favored localities and in favorable seasons asparagus, beans, celery, cucumbers, squash, and salsify have been grown by taking advantage of warm, sheltered spots with exposures toward the sun. Under ordinary conditions corn, melons, tomatoes, eggplant, and pumpkins have proved failures.

In the interior valleys grain can be successfully grown, and there has not been a year since 1900 when the majority of the varieties of oats, barley, and rye have not ripened at the Rampart station—latitude 65° 30' north. Wheat, both fall and spring sown, has ripened some years. Similar results have been secured at Fairbanks, in the Tanana Valley, but the work has not been in progress for as many years. In 1909, out of 60 varieties of grain of all kinds, 55 ripened their entire crop, as follows: Spring wheat, 1; winter wheat, 1; winter rye, 7; spring rye, 1; spring emmer, 1; spring barley, 29; and spring oats, 15.

At the interior stations especial efforts are being made to secure varieties of grain for introduction from high latitudes or elevations in Europe and Asia, and these are being improved by selection and breeding to secure hardy, early varieties for Alaska. Flax of excellent quality for fiber has been successfully grown at the Sitka station, though nothing has been made of this as an industry. It has often been claimed that the quality of the potatoes grown in Alaska is inferior, but this is disproved by more than 10 years' trial. Some varieties are not adapted to the soil and climate of Alaska, but a large number are, and more than \$1,500 worth of potatoes of good quality was sold by the Fairbanks station in 1910.

On the coast region of Alaska, and to some extent also in the interior, berries abound in a wild state, and the successful cultivation of many has been accomplished. Currants, gooseberries, cranberries, and strawberries are being grown in many places. At the Sitka station hybrid strawberries have been produced by the crossing of wild and domestic sorts, and a number of hardy new varieties are being grown that equal the best of the market varieties.

The work with live stock has been confined to what is often called southwestern Alaska. It was begun in 1906 with the purchase of some

pure-bred Galloway cattle, part of which were sent to Kenai and others placed on Kodiak Island. With the closing of the Kenai station they were all transferred to Kodiak, where they successfully maintained themselves until the volcanic eruption of 1912. The most of the cattle are kept on a reservation some 12 miles from the village of Kodiak, and in the summer of 1911 there were 82 pure-bred Galloways and about a dozen head of grade cattle in the herd. These animals have all been successfully wintered on hay and silage made from native grasses. The station has two 100-ton silos, which are filled with beach grass, and on this and wild hay, supplemented with a very little concentrated mill feed, the stock is kept in good condition. In 1909 the cattle received no shelter until November, when they were stabled at night and fed a little hay. Beginning December 2 silage was fed at night and hay in the morning, but the cattle were allowed to run on the range during the day. From January 1 to May 7, 1910, the ground at the station was covered with snow, and all stock was fed regularly. The total feeding period was little, if any, longer than is necessary in the more northern parts of the mainland of the United States. In 1908 the feeding period was about a month less than that of 1909. Within six weeks of beginning of grazing the stock was all in prime, fat condition. In 1909, 40 head of ewes were added to the stock kept at Kodiak, and 2 rams were purchased later. The number of sheep had doubled by the summer of 1910. At Kenai, Copper Center, and Fairbanks grain hay has been successfully made by sowing oats and cutting the crop before the grain has ripened. This can doubtless be done in most parts of Alaska where stock feed is needed and a very nutritious and palatable fodder obtained. There does not seem to be any reason why stock raising can not be made a success if care is exercised in the selection of the stock and they are properly sheltered and fed through the winter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I think I have shown that there are great possibilities of agricultural development in Alaska and I think I have shown it from the records of the department here.

Now, with reference to the mineral and other resources of Alaska, I am going to call the attention of the Senate to the gold, silver, copper, coal, and fisheries. I am not going to read it all, but I will ask to put it in the RECORD, so that Senators may verify what I have to say in reference to the matter.

A few days ago I called upon the Department of Commerce to supplement some statistics that had been heretofore furnished, probably to both the Senate and House committees, on the resources of Alaska. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Alaska, beginning in 1868 and ending in 1911, produced \$51,835,143 from its fur-seal skins alone. Its aquatic furs, except seals, amounted to \$12,496,063. The furs of land animals amounted to \$8,350,290. From furs of land animals alone Alaska has furnished to the United States more of money than the Territory cost us in 1868. That is just a single item, and one of the very smallest items. Walrus and whalebone products amounted to \$2,075,463. From fishery products the amount received was \$147,953,077. The total of these several products since 1868 down to and including 1911 is \$222,710,036, whilst the gold production amounted to almost as much as those several products together, the sum being \$195,916,520. The silver amounted to \$1,500,441; copper, \$8,237,594; gypsum, marble, and tin, \$820,850; coal, \$338,189. The total of these mineral products is \$206,813,594, and yet we find the minority members of the committee in 1868 reporting that the agricultural and mineral resources are nothing, and that report finds an echo in the report of the minority of the House committee on this very same subject, showing that there is something wrong somewhere in the efforts that these gentlemen then and now have made to ascertain what the facts were about Alaska.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the value of the output of the sea, fur, and mineral products of Alaska from 1868 to 1911, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Value of the output of sea, fur, and mineral products from Alaska, 1868 to 1911, inclusive.

Year.	Sea and fur products.						Mineral products.						Grand total.
	Fur-seal skins.	Aquatic furs, except seals. ¹	Furs of land animals.	Walrus and whale-bone products.	Fishery products.	Total.	Gold.	Silver.	Copper.	Gypsum, marble, and tin.	Coal.	Total.	
1868.....	\$708,734	\$446,245	\$306,638	\$1,461,617	\$1,461,617
1869.....	653,118	446,245	276,630	1,375,993	1,375,993
1870.....	188,126	446,245	263,648	898,019	898,019
1871.....	1,584,986	437,555	\$61,012	175,268	2,258,821	2,258,821
1872.....	1,231,580	437,555	281,838	157,300	2,108,273	2,108,273
1873.....	1,439,307	437,555	127,478	101,200	2,105,540	2,105,540
1874.....	1,498,176	437,555	129,149	116,182	2,181,062	2,181,062
1875.....	1,402,662	437,555	135,931	137,646	2,113,794	2,113,794
1876.....	857,203	437,555	189,503	231,201	1,715,462	1,715,462
1877.....	853,283	437,555	150,340	122,700	1,563,878	1,563,878
1878.....	1,110,145	437,555	149,394	184,422	1,881,516	1,881,518
1879.....	2,451,954	437,555	171,200	246,399	3,307,108	3,307,108
1880.....	2,465,539	437,555	200,654	179,200	3,282,946	\$20,000	\$826	\$20,826	3,303,772
1881.....	2,167,172	523,205	152,664	168,008	3,011,049	40,000	40,000	3,051,049

¹ The following data of the Bureau of Fisheries with respect to aquatic furs have been distributed by annual averages: 1868-1870, \$1,338,735; 1871-1880, \$4,375,551; 1881-1890, \$5,232,050; 1891-1900, \$862,250; 1901-1904, \$148,668.

Value of the output of sea, fur, and mineral products from Alaska, 1868 to 1911, inclusive—Continued.

Year.	Sea and fur products.						Mineral products.						Grand total.
	Fur-seal skins.	Aquatic furs, except seals. ¹	Furs of land animals.	Walrus and whale-bone products.	Fishery products.	Total.	Gold.	Silver.	Copper.	Gypsum, marble, and tin.	Coal.	Total.	
1882.....	\$1,436,906	\$523,205	\$128,952		\$267,111	\$2,346,174	\$150,000					\$150,000	\$2,496,174
1883.....	1,710,580	523,205	179,148		467,692	2,880,625	201,000	\$11,146				312,146	3,192,771
1884.....	1,454,650	523,205	269,710		500,145	2,747,710	201,000					201,000	2,948,710
1885.....	1,641,101	523,205	256,217		527,679	2,948,202	300,000					300,000	3,248,202
1886.....	1,987,793	523,205	266,134		746,186	3,523,318	446,000					446,000	3,969,318
1887.....	1,716,476	523,205	288,604		917,007	3,445,292	675,000					675,000	4,120,292
1888.....	2,298,204	523,205	232,185		1,447,478	4,501,072	850,000	2,181				852,181	5,353,253
1889.....	2,035,605	523,205	291,940		5,203,652	5,203,402	960,000	7,490				967,490	6,110,892
1890.....	1,673,757	523,205	294,562		2,330,500	4,822,024	762,000	6,071				768,071	5,590,095
1891.....	1,370,376	86,225	255,010		2,756,742	4,478,353	900,000	7,920				907,920	5,386,273
1892.....	1,018,184	86,225	280,768		1,784,510	3,175,687	1,080,000	7,000				1,087,000	4,262,687
1893.....	584,680	86,225	387,294		2,322,308	3,380,507	1,038,000	6,570				1,044,570	4,425,077
1894.....	859,259	86,225	383,235		2,486,852	3,815,571	1,282,000	14,257				1,296,257	5,111,828
1895.....	877,614	86,225	367,615		2,123,107	3,454,561	2,328,500	44,222				2,372,722	5,827,283
1896.....	872,454	86,225	227,432		3,120,844	4,306,955	2,861,000	99,087			\$84,000	3,044,087	7,351,042
1897.....	455,758	86,225	144,048		3,132,976	3,819,007	2,439,530	70,741				2,510,271	6,329,278
1898.....	474,320	86,225	81,372		3,420,329	4,071,445	2,317,003	54,575			14,000	2,385,575	6,457,021
1899.....	787,834	86,225	45,724		3,749,110	4,668,393	5,602,000	84,276			16,800	5,703,076	10,371,469
1900.....	1,282,096	86,225	147,633		5,303,294	6,819,248	8,165,000	45,494			16,800	8,228,294	15,047,542
1901.....	1,137,611	37,167	243,784		6,085,262	8,103,824	6,932,700	23,593	\$40,000		15,600	7,016,898	15,120,722
1902.....	1,160,396	37,167	240,539		8,310,394	9,748,396	8,283,400	48,590			19,048	8,302,438	18,140,804
1903.....	1,066,254	37,167	287,013		7,535,245	8,895,679	8,683,000	77,843			9,782	8,792,225	17,687,904
1904.....	620,940	37,167	126,829		6,458,585	7,243,521	9,160,000	114,934			7,225	9,557,835	16,801,356
1905.....	762,120	232,230	182,326	\$910,969	7,908,243	9,995,878	15,630,000	80,165			13,250	16,473,082	26,468,010
1906.....	786,757	30,369	108,049	196,538	8,524,372	9,616,355	22,035,794	136,345	1,133,290		17,974	23,324,373	32,940,758
1907.....	851,427	23,351	231,747	373,543	9,518,918	10,998,936	16,349,743	98,857	1,291,757	\$125,644	53,000	20,889,601	31,888,887
1908.....	822,970	31,828	323,480	148,382	11,140,161	12,466,821	19,292,818	71,906	605,267	141,348	14,810	20,126,149	32,692,970
1909.....	601,596	69,508	318,605	194,073	10,422,169	11,287,256	20,411,716	76,934	536,211	168,747	12,300	21,205,908	32,496,164
1910.....	473,207	111,790	318,605	136,791	12,650,191	13,571,979	16,126,749	85,239	538,695	169,026	15,000	16,985,309	30,767,288
1911.....	432,913	39,733	313,730	114,877	16,377,463	17,278,716	17,150,000	220,000	2,898,885	215,485	(5)	20,484,370	37,763,096
Total.....	51,835,143	12,496,063	8,350,290	2,075,463	147,953,077	222,710,035	105,916,820	1,500,441	8,237,594	820,850	338,189	206,813,594	429,523,630

¹ The following data of the Bureau of Fisheries with respect to aquatic furs have been distributed by annual averages: 1868-1870, \$1,338,735; 1871-1880, \$4,375,551; 1881-1890, \$5,232,050; 1891-1900, \$302,250; 1901-1904, \$148,668.

² Includes hair seal, 1868-1905, which can not be accurately distributed by years.

³ 1868-1905.

⁴ Product of seal islands only.

⁵ Estimated.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I want to say, Mr. President, that this information is accessible to all the members of the Senate. It is from Senate Document 882.

Mr. SMOOT. Of what session?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Sixty-second Congress, second session.

Mr. President, I am going to ask to have inserted in the Record a "comparative statement of the total commerce of Alaska and the commerce of specified insular possessions and foreign countries with the United States during years ended June 30, from 1904 to 1913, inclusive," furnished me by the Department of Commerce.

We have been spending immense sums of money on the Philippines. There everything seems possible. We have been spending money in our other insular possessions. Yet the commerce of Alaska is more than that of any of those possessions, except Porto Rico.

I am going to call attention to a few items. We will take the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913. For that year the commerce of Alaska was \$72,670,027. That is the largest commerce we have ever had with Alaska. Our business with Scotland during that time—that is, for 1913—was, in round numbers, \$60,000,000; with Spain, only \$54,000,000; with Russia in Europe, only \$52,000,000; with Ireland, only \$32,000,000; with Austria-Hungary, \$42,000,000; with Switzerland, only \$24,000,000; with Denmark, only \$21,000,000; with Sweden, \$23,000,000; with Norway, \$16,000,000; with Portugal, \$11,000,000; with Turkey in Europe, \$12,000,000; and with Greece, \$4,000,000. Yet the United States is putting out its every effort to invite traffic and trade with these foreign countries in everything the United States produces.

Now, let us go further. Take North America. Our business with Porto Rico in 1913 was \$73,693,628, only \$1,000,000 more than the business with Alaska. Yet that Territory is almost within a stone's throw of our Atlantic seaboard.

With British Columbia, which adjoins us on the whole of our northern border, our business was only \$53,000,000, \$20,000,000 less, if you please, than our business was during the same year with isolated Alaska, with its limited power of development because of lack of transportation facilities.

With the British West Indies it was only \$25,000,000; with Nova Scotia it was only \$29,000,000; with Panama it was only \$28,000,000; with Costa Rica, \$6,000,000; with Santo Domingo, \$9,000,000; with Guatemala, \$6,000,000; with Newfoundland and Labrador, \$6,000,000; with Haiti, \$7,000,000; with Honduras, \$6,000,000; with Nicaragua, \$4,000,000; with Salvador, \$3,000,000; and with British Honduras, \$3,000,000.

I read this to the Senate for the purpose of showing that, with the exception of Porto Rico, our commerce with Alaska exceeds our commerce with any other country to which I have alluded and others which I might name.

I am going to ask that this be inserted in the Record in order to show the conditions as they actually exist as between the United States and Alaska and countries in Europe and Asia. It is astounding when one comes to compare the vast amount of our business with this isolated country, shut off as it is from all assistance on the part of the United States, with our business with other countries not as far away from us as Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the matter will be inserted in the Record.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Comparative statement of the total commerce of Alaska and the commerce of specified insular possessions and foreign countries with the United States during years ended June 30, from 1904 to 1913, inclusive.

Countries.	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	Average.
Alaska.....	\$49,244,606	\$56,636,701	\$55,873,942	\$65,207,986	\$47,950,873	\$55,840,971	\$60,220,132	\$55,924,404	\$68,284,713	\$72,670,027	\$58,785,135
Europe:											
Scotland.....	51,526,053	42,118,601	51,394,833	55,362,547	50,867,896	47,480,827	48,783,807	51,250,997	54,417,047	60,870,611	51,354,321
Spain.....	24,108,517	25,824,981	29,788,989	34,757,049	36,058,091	37,456,967	37,417,681	44,849,914	46,988,924	54,691,735	36,824,294
Russia in Europe.....	30,838,222	28,340,284	29,538,475	30,337,393	27,455,798	26,684,746	32,980,084	34,528,431	42,182,583	52,322,495	34,121,470
Ireland.....	31,382,909	24,411,264	31,635,870	29,886,695	28,346,013	29,224,579	30,651,469	29,538,214	30,671,727	32,376,240	29,814,488
Austria-Hungary.....	18,597,971	22,176,950	28,755,452	31,145,814	31,609,397	29,603,290	32,371,641	30,472,883	39,102,724	42,513,110	31,240,023
Switzerland.....	19,805,095	20,662,055	23,820,608	27,443,053	25,344,676	24,582,228	26,357,107	26,965,929	24,814,052	24,086,729	24,288,233
Denmark.....	14,746,357	15,890,318	24,200,589	24,510,934	22,814,634	19,147,521	15,843,237	14,909,560	18,596,425	21,632,464	19,232,502
Sweden.....	9,715,803	10,132,752	11,836,641	13,884,913	14,806,482	11,217,446	12,822,373	16,505,242	18,972,766	23,278,785	14,187,320
Norway.....	6,883,195	6,625,049	9,148,633	9,477,805	10,510,535	10,449,722	12,501,315	15,365,895	16,583,441	16,809,817	11,435,549
Portugal.....	7,178,705	8,529,053	6,002,471	8,266,922	8,053,994	18,141,967	9,731,588	9,085,268	8,965,844	11,037,881	8,919,319
Turkey in Europe.....	4,351,948	5,700,740	7,332,967	8,064,860	5,972,533	8,289,717	10,302,937	10,076,581	12,449,948	12,134,963	8,472,719
Greece.....	1,831,175	1,452,762	2,272,134	2,720,848	4,810,407	3,619,499	3,072,675	3,700,369	3,700,007	4,399,011	3,422,595

Comparative statement of the total commerce of Alaska and the commerce of specified insular possessions and foreign countries with the United States during years ended June 30, from 1904 to 1913, inclusive—Continued.

Countries.	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	Average.
North America:											
Porto Rico.....	\$22,932,886	\$29,607,215	\$38,367,342	\$47,756,418	\$48,568,637	\$50,012,857	\$50,193,551	\$59,437,367	\$81,344,364	\$73,693,628	\$52,091,426
British Columbia.....	22,127,888	22,625,068	26,426,296	27,516,289	28,626,118	29,065,151	32,439,438	38,458,835	42,383,094	53,400,596	32,306,877
British West Indies.....	17,910,991	20,467,310	19,965,907	22,946,991	24,604,733	23,125,673	22,432,646	24,131,980	25,851,874	25,455,518	22,689,362
Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island.....	16,318,976	15,127,141	17,528,051	18,498,417	19,083,000	18,606,375	21,482,526	21,717,457	24,162,418	29,178,941	20,170,339
Panama.....	1,420,471	5,558,716	13,526,176	17,903,267	19,702,010	18,474,524	22,825,560	24,374,654	27,972,913	28,796,257	18,055,454
Costa Rica.....	5,465,457	6,065,163	6,960,614	7,436,020	7,101,909	5,017,090	6,691,803	8,311,792	7,465,038	6,613,643	6,712,253
Santo Domingo.....	4,429,186	6,330,998	5,104,589	5,880,716	7,286,937	6,233,200	5,569,118	7,437,782	8,810,552	9,531,541	6,661,461
Guatemala.....	3,883,183	5,736,175	6,294,982	6,721,402	4,120,867	4,854,645	3,791,570	4,994,257	5,163,089	6,765,568	5,232,573
Newfoundland and Labrador.....	3,794,073	3,633,654	4,329,241	4,398,608	4,756,808	5,087,718	5,304,490	5,985,317	5,867,644	6,040,493	4,919,864
Haiti.....	3,808,873	3,398,730	4,493,317	4,190,782	4,338,217	4,463,306	5,289,028	6,172,474	8,072,177	7,514,996	5,174,190
Honduras.....	3,575,368	3,841,657	3,357,116	4,129,612	4,037,065	3,650,384	3,617,718	4,783,023	5,242,241	6,369,353	4,260,553
Nicaragua.....	3,416,489	3,458,433	3,349,260	2,951,277	2,735,711	2,360,098	3,012,559	3,918,091	3,992,025	4,363,746	3,355,738
Salvador.....	1,885,580	2,431,595	2,533,010	2,774,353	2,339,012	2,432,272	2,493,350	3,564,505	3,941,238	3,761,539	2,815,645
British Honduras.....	1,709,933	1,591,360	1,893,626	2,035,121	2,036,534	1,930,823	2,278,261	2,746,956	2,129,239	3,029,427	2,197,833
South America:											
Chile.....	15,600,667	16,462,970	25,612,703	28,482,686	23,972,471	19,173,659	29,225,572	31,985,578	35,656,694	43,732,183	26,991,018
Colombia.....	12,610,102	9,992,582	10,575,907	9,393,398	9,833,130	10,689,374	11,465,027	13,900,394	16,968,340	23,377,608	12,830,586
Peru.....	6,861,275	6,810,189	7,288,250	11,033,941	13,630,195	10,944,403	12,169,550	14,911,153	15,646,528	17,003,482	11,630,397
Venezuela.....	10,043,813	10,323,425	11,292,834	10,876,843	9,281,047	10,881,820	9,498,562	11,426,876	15,361,594	16,589,449	11,557,626
Uruguay.....	3,779,734	5,149,550	5,617,143	6,573,676	5,253,457	7,087,190	11,636,041	6,931,447	10,112,001	9,972,842	7,214,308
Ecuador.....	3,713,401	4,252,553	4,642,067	4,785,862	4,310,314	4,580,029	5,075,065	5,867,344	5,872,538	5,591,474	4,869,124
Oceania:											
Hawaii.....	36,840,648	47,865,235	38,918,874	43,507,538	56,678,600	58,213,723	66,743,366	63,132,828	79,728,975	73,359,273	56,498,912
Philippine Islands.....	16,899,847	18,858,524	17,797,371	20,171,862	21,625,955	20,623,427	34,150,542	37,123,511	46,993,332	46,395,041	28,063,941
Total British Australasia.....	34,535,854	38,246,225	40,516,560	49,701,402	49,009,589	46,300,681	52,248,534	46,627,454	48,806,926	54,308,055	46,042,155
New Zealand.....				10,498,444	9,542,539	8,311,202	9,745,213	10,232,832	10,227,597	13,464,639	7,202,247
Africa:											
Egypt.....	8,433,201	9,333,240	10,554,749	17,840,783	14,989,434	12,494,648	13,158,953	23,789,249	19,115,317	21,568,661	15,127,823
Total Africa.....	33,656,902	29,884,225	32,191,075	37,638,492	36,631,240	32,144,061	36,041,119	50,820,727	46,629,312	55,514,261	39,115,141
Asia:											
China.....	42,027,513	51,337,903	72,305,581	59,141,074	48,364,579	48,218,747	46,310,982	53,515,339	53,934,931	60,337,634	56,549,428
British India.....	36,224,842	39,727,722	52,961,064	66,317,212	53,703,600	51,919,484	52,881,501	53,366,250	66,576,960	78,980,298	55,296,793
Dutch East Indies.....	11,935,390	20,132,453	22,341,680	13,442,083	16,277,316	25,589,599	12,893,190	13,147,761	17,034,573	9,373,647	16,216,867
Hongkong.....	11,977,766	12,321,982	8,873,947	11,072,950	11,104,417	9,039,821	8,798,938	10,474,453	13,448,234	14,450,581	11,155,998
Total Russia.....											
Europe and Asia.....	31,306,575	28,811,412	32,634,226	39,486,537	29,870,340	29,113,825	35,207,023	36,907,511	44,832,988	55,780,431	36,395,086
Total Turkey.....											
Europe and Asia.....	10,697,462	12,083,388	14,514,294	16,330,003	12,732,970	14,947,270	18,711,573	21,630,865	23,007,094	25,473,106	17,015,802

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator, with the permission of the Chair, whether the statement he now proposes to incorporate in the RECORD shows of what that commerce consists.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; it would not show it.

Mr. BACON. Is the Senator prepared to state it in a general way?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Not very well. I have not gone into that subject. It is too vast a subject to undertake to show just what the particular items were.

Mr. BACON. I am referring only to Alaska.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I practically covered that a little while ago.

Mr. BACON. I was called out of the Chamber. I suppose a large part of it included the gold exports.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. A good deal of it.

Mr. BACON. I mean the exports from Alaska to the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes. I will call the Senator's attention to the different items of Alaskan commerce.

Our largest business with Alaska was gold, \$195,916,520, but next in order and almost equal to it was \$147,953,077 as fishery

products alone. But I have asked to have inserted in the RECORD just what that showing is.

Taking the fisheries of Alaska, I wish to call attention to them to show the mammoth business done in Alaska in this industry. I am going to ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my address the pack of canned salmon on the Pacific coast, by years and waters, from 1864 to 1911. This I do for the purpose of comparing the canning that is done along the whole Pacific coast.

Take the State of Washington during these years. The total pack of salmon—that is, cases of salmon, a case containing 48 1-pound cans—was 13,070,452 cases. On the Columbia River it was 17,503,530; on the coastal streams of Oregon, 1,983,770; California, 1,445,674. Alaska, now, mind you, isolated as it is, produced 36,389,737 cases, while British Columbia produced 16,644,721 cases. In other words, Alaska produced 41.81 per cent of the whole salmon pack of the western coast of this country, and that, too, Mr. President, in the face of the most overwhelming difficulties of transportation and other conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the table will be inserted in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

Pack (cases) of canned salmon on the Pacific coast, by years and waters, 1864 to 1911.

[A case contains forty-eight 1-pound cans.]

Year	Washington.	Columbia River.	Coastal streams of Oregon.	California.	Alaska.	British Columbia.	Total.
1864.....				2,000			2,000
1865.....				2,000			2,000
1866.....		4,000					4,000
1867.....		18,000					18,000
1868.....		28,000					28,000
1869.....		100,000					100,000
1870.....		150,000					150,000
1871.....		200,000					200,000
1872.....		250,000					250,000
1873.....		250,000					250,000
1874.....		350,000		2,500			352,500
1875.....		375,000		3,000			378,000
1876.....		450,000		10,000		7,247	467,247
1877.....	5,500	380,000	7,804	30,000		58,387	481,691
1878.....	5,658	460,000	16,634	48,974	8,159	89,946	629,191
1879.....	1,300	480,000	8,571	13,855	12,530	61,093	577,349
1880.....	5,100	530,000	7,772	75,750	6,539	61,849	687,010
1881.....	8,500	550,000	12,320	181,200	8,977	169,576	930,573
1882.....	7,900	541,300	19,186	200,000	21,745	240,461	1,030,592
1883.....	1,500	629,400	16,156	123,000	48,337	163,438	981,831
1884.....	5,500	620,000	12,376	81,450	64,886	123,706	907,918
1885.....	12,000	553,800	9,310	90,000	83,415	108,517	857,042
1886.....	17,000	448,500	49,147	39,300	142,065	152,964	848,976
1887.....	22,000	356,000	73,996	36,500	206,677	204,083	899,256
1888.....	81,475	372,477	92,863	74,822	412,115	184,040	1,217,792

Pack (cases) of canned salmon on the Pacific coast, by years and waters, 1884 to 1911—Continued.

[A case contains forty-eight 1-pound cans.]

Year.	Washing- ton.	Columbia River.	Coastal streams of Oregon.	California.	Alaska.	British Columbia.	Total.
1889.....	11,674	309,885	98,800	57,300	719,196	417,211	1,614,066
1890.....	8,000	435,774	47,009	25,065	682,591	411,257	1,609,696
1891.....	29,029	398,953	24,500	10,353	801,400	314,511	1,578,746
1892.....	57,426	487,338	83,600	2,281	474,717	248,721	1,354,083
1893.....	127,909	415,876	52,778	26,436	643,654	610,202	1,876,915
1894.....	131,900	490,100	54,815	31,663	686,440	492,232	1,887,150
1895.....	214,017	634,696	77,878	29,035	626,530	587,692	2,169,843
1896.....	241,879	481,697	87,360	13,387	966,707	617,782	2,408,812
1897.....	536,926	552,721	60,158	38,543	909,078	1,027,183	3,124,600
1898.....	433,720	487,944	75,679	29,731	965,097	492,551	2,484,722
1899.....	965,165	332,774	82,041	34,180	1,078,146	765,519	3,257,825
1900.....	526,550	358,772	12,237	39,304	1,548,139	606,540	3,091,542
1901.....	1,456,090	390,183	58,618	17,500	2,016,804	1,247,212	5,186,407
1902.....	652,651	317,143	44,236	16,543	2,536,824	627,161	4,194,558
1903.....	484,378	339,577	54,861	8,200	2,246,210	473,847	3,607,073
1904.....	345,447	305,104	98,874	17,807	1,953,756	465,894	3,276,882
1905.....	1,055,641	397,273	89,055	2,780	1,894,516	1,167,822	4,607,087
1906.....	467,042	394,898	107,332	2,219,044	629,460	3,817,776
1907.....	725,462	324,171	79,712	2,169,873	547,459	3,846,677
1908.....	453,222	253,341	52,478	2,606,973	506,303	3,962,817
1909.....	1,664,760	274,087	58,169	5,633	2,395,477	903,060	5,391,186
1910.....	633,521	391,415	103,617	14,016	2,413,054	760,830	4,316,453
1911.....	1,644,550	543,331	153,828	11,746	2,820,066	948,965	6,122,486
Total.....	13,070,452	17,503,530	1,083,770	1,445,674	36,389,737	16,644,721	87,037,884
Per cent of total.....	15.02	20.11	2.28	1.66	41.81	19.12

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am calling attention to these things because there is sometimes a belief expressed that there is no commerce between the United States and Alaska, and it is preliminary to a discussion as to the necessity for the construction of a railroad and the betterment of transportation facilities there.

Mr. President, I am going to ask to have printed in the RECORD a comparative diagram—the figures only—showing the total commerce of Alaska and that of the countries mentioned therein. It is a comparison of the business of Alaska in 1910 and the latest information we have from other countries showing the balance in favor of Alaska. In that comparison we will take Alaska, Bulgaria, Formosa, Peru, German Colonies, Greece, Tunis, Serbia, Colombia, Venezuela, Honduras, Korea, Ecuador, Belgian Congo, Morocco, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Egypt-Sudan, Panama, Salvador, Paraguay, Crete, Dutch possessions in America, Nicaragua, Italy-Eritrea, and Liberia.

Alaska beats them all in the commerce which it has in the United States. Still Alaska is looked upon as a sort of summer resort for people who can not stand the hot weather in Washington. I wish we could all have been up there last summer, because then possibly we would have found out what the real Alaska is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the matter will be inserted in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Comparative statement showing total commerce of Alaska and that of specified countries.

Alaska, 1910.....	\$60,220,132
Bulgaria, 1910.....	59,137,000
Formosa, 1910.....	54,205,000
Peru, 1909.....	52,516,000
German colonies, 1909.....	52,387,000
Greece, 1909.....	46,173,000
Tunis, 1910.....	43,598,000
Serbia, 1910.....	35,135,000
Colombia, 1910.....	34,651,000
Venezuela, 1911.....	34,181,000
Honduras, 1910.....	33,491,000
Korea, 1910.....	29,729,000
Ecuador, 1910.....	20,083,000
Belgian Congo, 1910.....	19,480,000
Morocco, 1910.....	19,050,000
Santo Domingo, 1910.....	17,259,000
Haiti, 1910.....	17,109,000
Costa Rica, 1910.....	16,798,000
Guatemala, 1909.....	15,230,000
Egypt-Sudan, 1910.....	14,084,000
Panama, 1910.....	11,812,000
Salvador, 1910.....	11,043,000
Paraguay, 1910.....	11,034,000
Crete, 1908.....	7,613,000
Dutch possessions in America, 1909.....	7,177,000
Nicaragua, 1909.....	7,100,000
Italy-Eritrea, 1909.....	3,262,000
Liberia, 1908.....	1,850,000

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am going to ask also to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the comparative commerce of Alaska and other specified countries with the United States during eight years from 1904 to 1911, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Comparative statement showing total average annual commerce of Alaska and other specified countries with the United States during eight years from 1904 to 1911, inclusive.

Alaska.....	\$55,862,077
China.....	56,402,715
Hawaii.....	51,487,809
British India.....	50,887,709
Scotland.....	49,781,945
Porto Rico.....	45,734,534
Total British Australasia.....	44,659,821
Total Africa.....	36,125,080
Spain.....	33,320,286
Total Russia.....	32,917,181
Russia in Europe.....	30,838,704
Ireland.....	29,387,114
Austria-Hungary.....	28,848,050
British Columbia.....	28,410,635
Switzerland.....	24,247,694
Chile.....	23,815,162
Philippine Islands.....	23,406,380
British West Indies.....	21,948,279
Denmark.....	19,067,892
Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island.....	18,543,243
Dutch East Indies.....	16,970,057
Panama.....	15,473,172
Total Turkey.....	15,209,728
Egypt.....	13,824,282
Sweden.....	12,702,708
Colombia.....	11,057,739
Hongkong.....	10,457,647
Peru.....	10,456,145
Venezuela.....	10,453,152
Norway.....	10,120,280
New Zealand.....	9,306,044
Portugal.....	8,648,746
Turkey in Europe.....	7,517,785
Costa Rica.....	6,631,232
Uruguay.....	6,507,280
Santo Domingo.....	6,034,066
Guatemala.....	5,049,635
Newfoundland and Labrador.....	4,661,239
Ecuador.....	4,653,404
Haiti.....	4,519,341
Honduras.....	3,873,993
Nicaragua.....	3,150,240
Greece.....	3,129,991
Salvador.....	2,556,710
British Honduras.....	2,027,458

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have had that table inserted for the purpose of showing the commerce of Alaska as compared with the countries named.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to call attention to a balance sheet of the United States in account with Alaska from 1887 to 1911, both inclusive. This balance sheet is printed in the House and Senate hearings on the pending bill, and, if I am not mistaken, it was presented by Judge WICKERSHAM, the Delegate from Alaska, or prepared under his supervision. I am not prepared to say as to that, but I know it was presented by him. I may add that he has been an indefatigable fighter for the rights of Alaska and the people of Alaska.

This balance sheet gives on the debit side of the column the production of Alaska in figures—the gold, silver, copper, gypsum, marble, tin, coal, sea and fur products, and the fishery products. The total cash receipts are \$446,640,984.79 on the debit

side. On the credit side the total cash disbursements are given; that is, all the money that has been paid out for Alaska in all these years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the matter will be printed in the Record.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Balance sheet of United States in account with Alaska, 1867 to 1911, both inclusive.

Production:		Total cash disbursements:	
Minerals—		Original purchase price	\$7,200,000.00
Gold	\$195,916,520.00	Treasury, 1867-1911	23,158,126.06
Silver	1,500,441.00	Post Office, 1867-1911	5,458,548.19
Copper	8,237,594.00		
Gypsum	547,345.00		
Marble	185,443.00		
Tin	88,062.00		
Coal	338,189.00		
Sea and fur products—			
Fur-seal skins	51,835,143.00		
Aquatic furs, except seals	12,496,063.00		
Furs of land animals	8,350,290.00		
Walrus products	368,053.00		
Whalebone	1,707,410.00		
Fishery products	147,953,077.00		
Total cash receipts	17,117,354.79	To balance due Alaska	35,816,674.25
	446,640,984.79		410,824,310.54
			446,640,984.79

Mr. GALLINGER. But, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is it quite fair to have it represented that the United States has had the benefit of that enormous sum of money?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not mean to be understood as saying that the money was paid into the Treasury of the United States, but it has gone to enlarge the commerce of the United States and to benefit her citizens generally.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true, but private citizens have invested, perhaps not as large an amount as that, but enormously in producing that wealth. I make the observation for the reason that it is a very common statement—we find it in the newspapers and elsewhere—that the Government has invested so much money in Alaska, and Alaska has returned a very much larger amount, ten times as large perhaps; while, as a matter of fact, it is not money that goes directly to the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I recognize the force of the Senator's suggestions, and I agree with him, but I present it simply to show the business relations between the Territory and the United States. We are reaching out all the time for the commerce of different countries. We have many quarrels with Great Britain and Germany and Japan about the expansion of our commerce. We do all we can to get it, and they are doing all they can to get it. I am showing the immense commerce of Alaska, whether by private initiative or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield further to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I fully agree with the Senator as to the importance of developing those industries and the commerce, and I also agree that the purchase of Alaska was perhaps the best piece of business that the Government ever was engaged in, and the great wealth in minerals that come from Alaska has done us an immense amount of good. I appreciate that fully. Yet I propounded the question I did a moment ago for the reason that in the popular mind there is an idea that Alaska has turned into the Treasury this enormous amount in return for a smaller contribution from the Government. That is all I meant to say.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am glad the Senator called my attention to it, because I did not intend to be a party to misleading the public. It was simply for the purpose of comparison, to show the great amount of business which is done between the United States and Alaska and the balance in favor of Alaska.

Mr. President, I might discuss more at length the commerce of Alaska, but I think I have given enough to show that it is not a mere bagatelle. The business we do with her 65,000 of population amounts to a great deal to this country.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. BACON. As a matter of information, I should like to inquire of the Senator whether in that aggregate of commerce he includes the fur-seal business?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; the whole business.

Mr. BACON. Of the Aleutian Islands?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Everything; everything in the so-called Russian North America that we acquired by the purchase.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the aggregate?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that the total amount was \$446,640,984.79.

Mr. President, I will not undertake to read it to the Senate, although I intended to comment upon it, but I am taking more time than I had any idea I would take, and I ask to have inserted in the Record in connection with my remarks what was said by the railroad commission of the Railway Routes in Alaska accompanying the President's message.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

COMMERCE.

The Territory of Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867 for \$7,200,000. Up to the close of 1912 it has produced minerals, fishery products, and furs to a value of about \$460,000,000. Alaska's commerce includes northward shipments of food products, merchandise, machinery, lumber, coal, etc., and return shipments of gold, silver, copper, salmon, halibut, etc. The average annual value of this growing commerce during the five years ending with 1912 is nearly \$50,000,000. In addition to this, the Territory produces annually some lumber, farm products, etc., which are consumed locally and as to the value of which no accurate figures are available, but is probably about half a million dollars.

The average value of the merchandise shipped annually from the United States to Alaska during the five years ending with 1911 is \$18,740,256. The highest value during this period for any one year (1909) was \$17,705,330; the lowest (1911), \$15,170,100. It should be noted that the value of the shipments to Alaska for the year 1912 was much larger than any of the preceding six years. Complete statistics are still lacking, but the value of the shipments to Alaska for the first 11 months of 1912 was \$21,585,587. The total for the year will, therefore, exceed \$22,000,000, an amount several millions of dollars greater than the maximum for any one year, as above indicated. An average of about 22 per cent of the above annual value is made up of the shipments made to St. Michael and Yukon Basin. This includes some shipments to Canadian Yukon. There is also a considerable amount of commerce with inland points reached along the valleys of the Copper and Susitna Rivers, but, unfortunately, there are no statistics of the value of this trade.

It is estimated that during this five-year period an average of some 42,000 tons of merchandise were shipped into the Yukon region. This includes the traffic into the Iditarod-Innoko region, into the Tanana region, and into the Canadian Yukon. The greatest average for any one year was 50,000 (1909), and the lowest 40,500 (1910). It has been estimated that of this freight an average of 24,000 tons is shipped into the Fairbanks-Rampart region, the highest being 33,000 tons for 1909 and the lowest 15,000 tons for 1911. The information at hand indicates that about 8,500 tons have been annually shipped into the Innoko-Iditarod region during the years 1910 and 1911. A small amount of freight is also carried into Fairbanks over the military road during the winter months, and some also reaches the Kuskokwim Valley by direct shipments to the mouth of that stream.

The in and out bound passenger traffic to and from Alaska, not including tourists or cannery employees bound to remote places, amounted to 50,816 in 1910 and 43,293 in 1911. A part of this represents the travel into the Klondike and other districts of the Canadian Yukon. Most of this travel was to and from coastal points. The average annual passenger travel to the Fairbanks region by steamboat route for 1910-11 is estimated to be about 2,000, and 1,000 to the Iditarod-Innoko region. About 800, in addition, travel in and out of Fairbanks by a stage during the winter months, and probably 1,000 go in and out on foot. In addition to these, there are also several hundred who travel in and out of the Iditarod-Innoko region by the Kuskokwim River or by the winter trail to Seward.

The average value of the outbound shipments from Alaska for the five years ending in 1911, and including mineral products, fish, furs, etc., is \$32,200,392. The highest value for any one year was \$35,910,701 (1911), and the lowest, \$29,151,404 (1910). The only outbound shipments from the Yukon and Kuskokwim Basins are gold and silver. The same is true of the Susitna Basin and a large part of the Copper River

Basin, where there is, however, one mine which has been shipping copper ore for two years. While much of the value of the outbound shipments is represented by gold, silver, and copper, the greater part of the actual tonnage is made up of the fishery products, which are not dependent on inland transportation.

This commerce is carried on by vessels which ply between Alaska and west coast ports. Its importance is indicated by the records of clearances and entrances of vessels. In 1910 a total of 451 domestic vessels, with a total tonnage of 396,740, entered, and 419, aggregating 384,967 tons, cleared Alaska ports. In 1911 the entrances were 514 vessels, with an aggregate tonnage of 426,986; and clearances, 495 vessels, with an aggregate tonnage of 421,905. Trade in foreign bottoms was as follows: In 1910, 393 vessels, with an aggregate of 244,694 tons, entered, and 366 vessels, with an aggregate of 183,284 tons, cleared. In 1911, 367 vessels, with an aggregate of 187,849 tons, entered, and 331 vessels, with an aggregate of 156,647 tons, cleared. These figures for foreign bottoms include the clearances of the Canadian steamers on the Yukon.

The traffic on the Yukon and its tributaries is carried on by 58 river steamers, varying in capacity from 6 to 588 net tons and with an aggregate net tonnage of 14,081. There are also 12 steamers on the Kuskokwim, with a net tonnage of 1,568. To arrive at the total tonnage it will be necessary to add that of the scows and barges used on the Yukon, of which there are 56, aggregating 25,393 net tons. About 60 vessels clearing from Puget Sound are regularly engaged in Alaska traffic. This does not include the whaling ships, cannery tenders, or small gasoline boats.

The commission employed Mr. Harry L. Muchmore as statistician, and he spent some two months in collecting data from which the above figures were taken. A fuller report on commerce is presented in the Appendix B (p. 144).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That report shows in briefer form than it is possible for me to put it the commerce between Alaska and the United States.

Mr. President, some one asked me a while ago as to the number of miles of railway constructed in Alaska. I call attention to the Senate committee hearings, at page 288, where are given all the railroads constructed in Alaska. If Senators will take the trouble to examine the map hanging on the wall they will find that it shows practically a disconnected system of railways, which do not help the transportation situation at all.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Oregon would identify these railroads in some way by their ownership as he goes on.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say in this connection that it is impossible for one to read the testimony before the committees and find out just who does own them, but I will say to the Senator that Delegate WICKERSHAM, who is thoroughly familiar with the situation up in Alaska, who sat on the bench in the Territory and heard and learned the conditions as they actually existed, who has traveled all over the district, and who has had litigation one way and another with all these interests, has produced evidence tending to prove that there are hardly any of these railroad lines along the southern coast of Alaska that do not belong to the Alaska syndicate or in which the Alaska syndicate is not interested. That is not only true of the Cordova & Northwestern, but it is true with reference to the Alaska Northern, which runs from Seward to Kern Creek.

Mr. CUMMINS. Were the 71 miles of the Alaska Northern road built by Canadian capital?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The first 20 miles was built by Mr. John E. Ballaine, of Seattle. It was then known as the Alaska Central. He sold to Frost & Osborne, of Chicago and Toronto. Frost & Osborne got into financial difficulty, and the road went into the hands of a receiver, and finally the stock came into the control of a Canadian bank, which later failed. I think the evidence shows conclusively that the Morgans were interested in the stock of that bank; and not only that, but it convinces me that the same people were largely interested in the White Pass & Yukon Railway, that runs up from Skagway through American territory into British territory to the headwaters of the Yukon.

So all of the railroads in Alaska that amount to anything at all and that might under different conditions develop the country are in the hands of the men whose interest it has been to throttle the development of Alaska and get it all—not only the railroads, but the industries of Alaska as well—into their control. I am warranted in making that statement not from any knowledge on my part, but from statements which have been made before committees of the House and of the Senate. In one of the cross-examinations of one of the witnesses there he reluctantly admitted all of the things which I am now asserting.

The other railroads which exist are the Seward Peninsula Railroad, from Nome to Shelton, with a spur to Paystreak, aggregating 86½ miles, and they cost \$2,000,000. That is at Nome, and simply runs from Nome into some mining district which they hope to develop up there. Then there is the Tanana Valley Railroad, from Fairbanks to Chitina, with a spur to Chena, 45 miles long, which cost \$1,000,000. It was built to some of the mining districts for the purpose of aiding in the development of that section. The Council City & Solomon River Railway runs from Solomon to Penelope, 32½ miles, and cost \$1,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the gauge of these roads?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will state them again.

Name of road and terminals.	Gauge.	Miles.	Estimated cost.
Copper River & Northwestern (Cordova to Kennicott).	Standard....	200	\$20,000,000
Alaska Northern R. R. (Seward to Kern Creek).do.....	71	5,000,000
Seward Peninsula Ry. (Nome to Shelton with spur to Paystreak).	3 feet.....	86.5	2,000,000
Tanana Valley R. R. (Fairbanks to Chitina, with spur to Chena).do.....	45	1,000,000
Council City & Solomon River Ry. (Solomon to Penelope).	Standard....	32.5	1,000,000
Wild Goose R. R. (Council to Ophir Creek).	3 feet.....	7	200,000
Yakutat & Southern (Yakutat to Situk River).do.....	9	100,000
White Pass & Yukon Ry. ¹ (Skagway to White Horse).do.....	110	6,000,000

¹ Only 20 miles of the line are in Alaska.

One of the peculiar situations that developed in the examination of witnesses with reference to transportation matters in Alaska was that neither the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad nor the Alaska Northern Railroad was intended to develop the interior of Alaska; and the men who are connected with those roads now all came on the witness stand, as I recall it, and each and every one of them stated their purpose. One said that they intended to go to the Matanuska coal fields, and another stated that they wanted to get out to the Kennicott copper mines, to the Guggenheim interests, and that when they reached that point they had no other interest in the matter at all. The Guggenheims wanted to reach their copper; they owned the railroad to the mines, and they practically owned and controlled transportation from the open port on the ocean to their smelters in Tacoma and in California. So they had absolute control of the situation so far as transportation was concerned. It was only to put their own product in the market, and they never intended to extend that line. One of the managers of the White Pass & Yukon Railroad said, in opposing the bill for the construction of a railroad in Alaska, that he did not want the Government of the United States to build it. Why? He admitted that it would assist in developing Alaska; but he did not want it built simply because it would parallel his line up from Skagway to White Horse in Canada and the boats of the company from White Horse to Dawson on the Yukon and thence down to Fairbanks; and the only opposition to the proposition was that the Government of the United States was going into competition with a private enterprise.

As soon as the Cunningham claimants undertook to acquire title to the Bering River coal mines we find the Guggenheims making a contract with these claimants, under the terms of which they were to acquire these coal mines. Then the Cordova & Northwestern Railroad, controlled by the Guggenheims, started in to extend branch lines into the coal mines. They did not intend to go into the interior of Alaska at all. What interest had they in developing the country? They were building these railroads for the purpose of getting coal and getting their own copper output to their smelters, and they had control, as we all know, of all the smelters in this country; they absolutely owned and controlled the smelters on the Pacific coast; so that if a private individual developed a magnificent copper mine on the line of the Cordova & Northwestern Railroad he could not get its product to market, for the Guggenheim people not only fixed the rate of transportation, but they fixed the rate at which the copper should be smelted after it got to the smelters, because the Guggenheims owned both.

It was the same way with the Alaska Northern Railroad. The owners of that road had no idea of going into the interior of Alaska. The purpose of the Alaska Northern people was to get into the Matanuska coal fields, the largest in Alaska, and when they got in there to get control of the output. That was the end of their ambitions and desires.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. That road did not reach the coal fields—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No. Why?

Mr. CUMMINS. But the company is practically in a state of dissolution now.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is 60 miles or more from the coal fields.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is right.

Mr. CUMMINS. And the other road did not reach the coal fields either.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Why?

Mr. CUMMINS. I wish the Senator would state that.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will tell the Senator why.

Mr. CUMMINS. I want that to become a part of the Senator's speech.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Before the Cordova & Northwestern Railroad was extended into the Bering River coal fields the President of the United States, seeing that the Alaska syndicate was making an attempt to monopolize the coal industry of that region, withdrew the coal resources from acquisition by anybody. Therefore railroad building stopped. If they could not get control of the mines, as they had attempted to do by contract, they did not care to go on and develop Alaska for the benefit of others; but the President withdrew the property and nobody could acquire title. The Alaska & Northern intended to go to the Matanuska coal fields, and the reason they did not do so, I will say to the Senator from Iowa, was because the President of the United States withdrew the Matanuska coal fields from acquirement by anybody, and there was no incentive to those people to build farther. The record here is full of evidence that if the Guggenheims had been permitted to acquire title to the Bering River coal fields, and the Alaska Northern had been permitted to acquire title to the Matanuska coal fields, the roads would have been extended without any question of doubt; but that would not have benefited the interior of Alaska. That would simply have been a matter for their own special benefit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand the Senator's position, then, it is substantially this: That the system of railways heretofore outlined for Alaska and partially constructed were practically private enterprises, collateral to the larger enterprise of coal monopoly and coal supply, of metalliferous mining monopoly and metalliferous mining supply, instead of being constructed as great public highways for the development of Alaska and for the common use of the people.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is right; and I want to say something directly in that connection. I may be mistaken about names—I have not read the testimony over recently—but my recollection is that Mr. Dickeson, who was connected, I think, with the White Pass road, testified, in terms, that he opposed the construction of this railroad by the Government because it would develop interior Alaska and take away from his line up the Yukon River to Dawson and from Dawson to Skagway business that he was now entitled to. What difference did it make to him? The only thing he cared for was the charging of the enormous rates that they were charging for the transportation of freight from the seacoast to Fairbanks and from Fairbanks out.

There has never been an effort made in Congress to assist Alaska in developing her resources that the same men who are here in opposition to this railroad legislation have not been here fighting it. It is the same crowd. I think I can look up in the gallery and see some of them now. They appear before every committee that has for its purpose a proposition looking to the opening up of the resources of Alaska, unless they are so opened up that they can acquire title, fill their capacious maws, and put everything in reach of their transportation facilities. I do not care what the measure happens to be, their effort has been constantly and always to see to it that whatever is done in Alaska shall not be in the interests of the ultimate consumer nor in the interests of the people of the country. Theirs is and has always been a purely selfish policy. I desire now to discuss the rates charged for transportation of passengers and freight in Alaska.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator enters into the question of rates, I should like to know where, in the opinion of the Senator, the railroad to be built by the Government, if we pass this bill, should be built? I am much interested in knowing whether the project generally includes the taking over by the Government of the roads that are already built, and if they are to be taken over, at what price. I do not want to see the Government go in and spend \$100,000,000 or \$500,000,000—because there is no limit in this bill at all—to make railroad property in Alaska, that is now comparatively worthless, valu-

able, and then the Government to be put in a position so that it must take over these railroad properties at a valuation greatly increased by the very things the Government has done. I say to the Senator from Oregon very frankly that that is the only objection I have to the bill—at least that is one of the objections I have to the bill as it is.

I am in favor of the Government building a railroad in Alaska or a series of railroads there; I am in favor of the Government operating a railroad or a series of railroads in Alaska; but I am afraid of the tremendous and undefined and uncontrolled power that this bill proposes to confer upon the President of the United States or any other officer of the Government; and I am particularly anxious, therefore, that the Senator from Oregon shall develop, as his committee must have had the question under consideration and must have reached some conclusion, the general plan that ought to be pursued for the opening up of Alaska, where the railroads should be built, and what purposes they must serve in transporting minerals, coal, agricultural products, and everything of that kind. I think that we ought to know what the plan is for the building of the railroads there.

I do not feel like saying to the President of the United States, "Here is an unlimited sum of money; go on and build whatever railroads in Alaska you think ought to be built, and take whatever property you think ought to be condemned." I think the Senator from Oregon will agree with me about that general principle, and I think that he ought to tell us, if it has been under consideration by the committee—and I doubt not that it has—how he thinks Alaska should be developed, where the railroads should be built, and to what extent they should be built.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that there is not very much room for disagreement about the selection of the route, because Alaska is not only sui generis in being owned almost entirely by the United States, but she is sui generis in only having a very few gateways to the interior which are accessible at all seasons of the year.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will answer the Senator in a moment. Take navigation up to Nome or to the mouth of the Yukon or to the Kuskokwim River, and it is only open for three or four months in the year, at the outside, because of ice, so that the only open ports, the only gateways to Alaska—in other words, the only places where there are passes through the mountains and into the interior of Alaska all the year round—are confined to three or four points along the southern coast.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is what I understand. They are on the south shore. Now, at least three of them—two or three—are already occupied.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Practically two.

Mr. CUMMINS. Two. Now, it is proposed that the Government shall from those shores, those open ports or open bays or harbors, build roads up into the interior of the country so as to serve every purpose that a railway can serve in a populated and developed country. Those routes are already occupied to a degree. What I want to know is whether it is in the contemplation of the committee that the roads that are already there shall be bought, shall be condemned and taken over by the Government, and whether it is the idea that the Government shall extend the lines that have already been built by the syndicate to which the Senator has referred? I can not conceive that it would be economically defensible to build another line of road up the same gulch or gorge, in view of the amount of business there, and I think it makes a great difference whether the Government shall extend these lines—that is, shall build lines in extension of these lines into the interior—and condemn that property thus made valuable by the expenditure of the Government money, or whether it shall take that property before the Government undertakes to make it valuable by projecting it into the interior.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I see the position which the Senator takes. The committee did have under discussion to a considerable extent the question as to the power which the President might have with reference to the condemnation or purchase of existing roads. If the Government should parallel the Cordova & Northwestern, for instance—I am not sure that the evidence showed whether they could or not, but assuming that the Government did parallel it—and then extend its line from Chitina, which is the northern point of the present road, into Fairbanks, it would absolutely paralyze and render worthless the Cordova & Northwestern. It is the same in reference to the Seward route.

I assume that under the powers given the President under this bill either to purchase or to condemn, he would exercise that discretion which the bill intends to give him after having

had the whole situation overlooked by the men he is to appoint to investigate the situation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Possibly; but I take it for granted that men of ordinary prudence would not build another line up the narrow gorges leading from the sea into the interior of the country. Certain railways have been built there and they are of a certain value. One of them, I think, is practically of no value, and the other is not of great value. They can not go on, or they do not go on, because there seems to be nothing to promise sufficient business in the interior to warrant their further extension. I want the Government to own the railroads there and to operate them, but I think that Congress ought to determine, in the first instance, whether it can buy or take those railroads at a fair price.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They have the power to condemn under the bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe that you can substitute the discretion of the President for that of Congress with respect to the value of those two railroads.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I call the Senator's attention to this clause of the bill?

The President may acquire, by purchase or condemnation, all property he may deem necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, and he may exercise in the name of the United States the power of eminent domain in the courts of Alaska in accordance with the laws now or hereafter in force for that purpose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely; but suppose that you institute proceedings in condemnation or pursue negotiations and reach in either way a certain result as to the value of that railway property. I think Congress ought then to say whether it wants to take those railroads at those prices. I think that is too much power to give to any one man. Moreover, it might very well be that, instead of taking the property at a price determined by condemnation proceedings, we would prefer to build an independent line of our own. I do not believe that the Government ought to pay any more for these railroad properties than they are worth—worth now, worth in view of the fact that there is no motive for their extension; I do not believe that the Government ought to be called upon to pay a price that either of them might bear after the Government has decided to extend them so that they may become valuable. That is my point.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Of course it would not do to undertake to tie the hands of the President by fixing the price. I will say to the Senator now that whenever you undertake to ascertain the value of these railways through a committee of Congress you are right up against the same proposition that we have had to fight all the time. There must be discretion vested in somebody; we must trust some of the officers of the Government.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that be so, I would rather see the bill amended so as to require the condemnation of those properties, and then allow us to determine, after they are condemned, whether the Government will extend them into the interior, in order to prevent the addition to the value of those properties which the definite action of Congress will inevitably give to them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I assume that the Senator would not want to destroy the property there in which investments have actually been made.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to see the United States buy the existing roads, and I should like to see it give every penny that they are worth. These people, however, have gone forward and invested their money under conditions as they then were. It may be a good investment or it may be a bad investment. If it be a bad investment, I do not think the Government ought to make it a good investment; but whatever the property is fairly worth, that the Government ought to pay; and if we can not buy them at a price that would fairly represent their value, then we ought not to add to their value by extending them into the country and converting a bad investment into a good one.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think that is just the power that the President is given under this bill now. Whatever officers he may appoint as his agents to construct the railroad or railroads in Alaska must negotiate with these people, and if in such negotiations a price is asked which is out of reason, then the President has the power of condemnation. It seems to me that the President ought to have that power; it must be vested somewhere, and he must have discretion; otherwise it would be impossible to get anywhere in the development of Alaska.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if a very careful computation has been made as to the amount of money that will be required to construct the proposed railroad? I observe

that the bill names a sum of \$40,000,000, for which coupon bonds bearing a rate of interest of 3 per cent shall be issued by the Secretary of the Treasury; but a little while ago the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], perhaps with no more complete knowledge on the subject than I have, suggested that he did not think the Government ought to spend \$100,000,000 or \$500,000,000. I should like to ask the Senator what the possibility is of this expenditure reaching far beyond the \$40,000,000 named in the bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have read the bill, and I think the Senator from Oregon will agree with me that there is no limit whatever upon the authority of the President to enter into engagements in the name of the United States for the building of railways in Alaska or the purchase of railways already there.

Mr. GALLINGER. The closing section of the bill would seem to indicate that.

Mr. CUMMINS. The \$40,000,000 for which bonds are to be issued is simply intended to provide the immediate funds necessary for the work. I take it that it is agreed that the President could go on and expend a hundred million dollars or more if he believed it to be wise to do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the very point I wanted elucidated—

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. As to the probable ultimate expenditure under this bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is a matter that can be very easily cured. It was the intention of the committee to limit it to the amount specified in the bill; but that is a matter that can be very easily remedied if there is any doubt on the subject.

Mr. CUMMINS. That really does not cover the point that I have been suggesting, because if we go into the business there—and I believe the Government ought to do it; I am with the Senator from Oregon upon that subject—then we must go further and complete the project, and the United States must do whatever it is necessary to do to develop the country, whether it costs forty million dollars or a hundred million dollars.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I want to suggest to the Senator in that connection that the Alaska Commission did make estimates and did make recommendations from their standpoint as to where the roads ought to be built. On page 141 of the commission's report they suggest practically the extension of the existing lines there.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know that, and I know that the purpose of this bill is to extend the lines that are already there.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No—

Mr. CUMMINS. In part, at least; and I do not want to see these lines extended under such circumstances as will require us to pay a price for the railroads induced or influenced very largely by what we ourselves do.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. For the purpose of relieving the apprehension that seems to exist in the mind of the Senator from Iowa, I desire to say that the commission reports that it is not necessary to purchase or condemn the Copper River and Northwestern Railroads. They can run out of Cordova, across Marshall Pass to Copper City, or out from Valdez, without touching the Copper River Railroad at all.

Second, with reference to the Alaska Northern, reports have recently come in of the possibility of reaching Prince William Sound by a tunnel 2 miles in length that will render it unnecessary to take the Alaska Northern. The Government is in a situation where it can say to the owners of these roads, "We will buy at such a figure, or we will construct along other lines," and the other lines would not parallel.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, Mr. President, I have had it in my mind all the time that it was the policy of the Government to purchase these roads. I do not believe in building unnecessary railroads or in paralleling lines that already are sufficient to do the business. It is bad economy and wasteful to do so. I want the Government to buy them at a fair price, and if they are losing ventures I want the Government to buy them as losing ventures.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Would not the Senator assume that a fair valuation of the railroads would be arrived at by condemnation proceedings?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can only suggest to the Senator from Oregon that if a condemnation proceeding is carried forward after the Government has undertaken to extend them to the interior, so that they will reach a source of trade, the value found by the jury of condemnation would be much greater than

though that were not a fixed fact. The Senator from Oregon can readily see that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. It is true that the bill provides for a standard-gauge railroad or railroads; but in my opinion those who are interested in this bill understand, from all of the testimony which has been given and all that has been said upon all sides of the question, that there is to be but one main road constructed by the United States. I believe the understanding in the minds of most of the people is that it will be the Alaska Northern Railroad route. I think that is understood. In fact, I know the people who are interested in that road are very much interested in this bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The evidence seems to disclose that that road will go through the richest section of the country, up through the Shushitna and other valleys.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say whether it is the richest section or not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I say, the evidence seems to disclose that.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the evidence discloses, however, that the Alaska Northern will meet with difficulty in passing over three high points, where the grade of the road will be very heavy. In the case of the Copper River road, of course, if that route should be adopted, the grade is a natural grade, at least to the Matanuska coal fields.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the 71-mile road?

Mr. SMOOT. No; that is the 200-mile road.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There are only 71 miles of it built, however.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; there are only 71 miles of it built.

I am in favor of the Government of the United States building one line of railroad. I would have very much preferred to see this bill provide only for a main line of railroad, not for railroads. Then, of course, provide for branch lines, sidings, switches, and so forth.

I can not see why the committee reported a bill giving the President authority to build two main lines of railroad. What is wanted is a railroad from Resurrection Bay or from Cordova Bay right through the country to Fairbanks. When that one line is built, it seems to me that is all that ought to be built by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the President has the power to stop whenever and wherever he feels disposed to stop after he receives the full report of his engineers. We discussed all of that matter in committee, and reached the conclusion that if the President had the power of condemnation or the right of purchase, he would have all the power that anybody wanted. I know the railroad interests up there that are opposed to this bill do not want any condemnation proceedings, because they say they would get the worst end of it; and they not only oppose condemnation, but they do not want any agreement to purchase. In other words, they do not want anything done that will interfere with the status quo in Alaska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will yield, but really I am anxious to get through.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not interrupt the Senator if he prefers that I shall not do so.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. The question I wanted to ask the Senator from Oregon was in regard to a particular provision of the bill. If he is going to discuss the details of the bill later, I will not ask my question now.

I wanted to ask the Senator—and I hope if he does not discuss it now, he will before he closes—as to the proviso at the end of section 1, commencing on line 18, page 8, as follows:

Provided, That the President may cause said road or roads to be operated by contract or lease—

And so forth.

I wanted to ask the Senator what the theory of the committee was in regard to that, and whether the committee contemplated that after these roads were built by the President they should be leased to private parties?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the President saw fit to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think that ought to remain in the bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think it ought, for this reason: The Government owns the coal mines, and they may be operated under a lease; and the committee thought the President ought to have the power to lease the railroads if he saw fit to do so. The main purpose of the bill was not to have the Government own and operate a railroad. The main purpose of it was to develop Alaska. If, in the President's opinion, that could be best accomplished by the leasing system, not as a money-making proposition but as a development proposition, he ought to have that power; and we felt that that was the proper power to give him.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to take up the time of the Senator now, but it has always seemed to me that that was a serious objection and that that language ought to be stricken out. It seems to me that if we are able as a Government to build the road, we ought to be able as a Government to operate it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will call the attention of the Senator to one railroad that has been mentioned by Mr. Fisher, in his testimony before the Senate committee, that is owned by a city—Cincinnati—and operated under a lease system, resulting not only in the development of a certain section of the country and the benefiting of Cincinnati itself, but in profit to it as well. It is now leased to some company that is operating it. At all events, that is the only one I know of, and I had that in mind, at least, when this matter was being prepared. It seemed to me the Government might see fit to lease the road rather than to operate it after it was completed.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Oregon will permit me just to make a suggestion, I will interrupt him no more, because I want him at some time during the course of the debate on this bill to clear my mind of some doubt I have with regard to it. It is perfectly plain to me, just from the language of the bill, that what is intended is that the President shall build a road into the interior from the present inland termini of the two roads that are already there.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me interrupt the Senator right there. I want to say that that subject was not discussed by any member of the subcommittee that prepared this bill. None of them had that in mind.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then the bill ought to be changed, because the language that is used indicates that there is where the Government is to build the road, on one or the other of the routes or both. The amount of money provided for by the issue of bonds indicates that that is what must be done, and that that money is not sufficient, I take it, to purchase both of these roads.

Does not the Senator from Oregon see just what will happen? Another part of the bill gives this railroad the power to connect with any existing lines of railway, to make joint freight rates, and to establish joint routes over the Government line and any connecting privately owned line. Just as surely as the seasons come, if the Government takes up this railroad building at the internal termini of these two railroads and extends them into the country, into the coal fields, into other mining properties, and into the agricultural region, then if we ever come to purchase or condemn those parts of the railway system lying between the Government-owned railroads and the sea we will have to pay a very much larger sum of money for them than they are worth at this time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think there is no question about that suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. That has seemed to me to be putting the cart before the horse. If we are going to use these railroads as a part of the Government system, I think we ought to take them now or ascertain what we can get them for, and then, after we find out what we can get them for, determine before we take one step further whether we shall condemn them or purchase them, or whether we shall build independent lines of our own.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the course suggested by the Senator is followed, the fate of Alaska will be the same in the future as it has been in the past. It means another year of interminable effort on the part of those people who have been hemmed in from the world, with nothing done for Alaska.

It seems to me we must assume that the agents and officers appointed by the President of the United States will endeavor in perfect good faith to ascertain before any line of construction is begun what those roads can be acquired for. I believe there is no part of our public service that has shown a better record for efficiency and honesty than the military and naval arm of the service. Those are the men who will have this matter in charge. Can we not trust them?

I see the force of what the Senator says; but can we not trust these men when the power is given to the President under

the bill to go there and do what seems best for the Government of the United States; to ascertain, it may be, the cost of the roads that are now on the ground and perhaps to purchase them, if the President thinks the figures at which they are offered are right; and if they undertake to hold up the Government in that respect as they have attempted to hold up other people along other lines, then to condemn their property, if need be, or build a parallel line somewhere else.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the Senator from Oregon assumes something that I have not found in the bill, although it may be there.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. What is that?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe the bill gives to the President any power either to condemn or to purchase either of these railroads.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. What does this language mean?—

The President may acquire, by purchase or condemnation, all property he may deem necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, and he may exercise, in the name of the United States, the power of eminent domain in the courts of Alaska, in accordance with the laws now or hereafter in force for that purpose.

Mr. CUMMINS. What are "the provisions of this act"?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. To extend a railroad from an open port to the interior.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; we return to the first lines of the bill, and we are informed—

That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be located such main lines for railroads from points on tidewater to the interior as will in his judgment best promote the settlement of Alaska, develop its resources, and provide adequate and suitable transportation for coal to the Army.

And so forth.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is, from the interior to the seaboard, according to the last clause the Senator read.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly; but I do not gather from the bill that it was the purpose of the committee which drafted it that we should proceed with the condemnation of these lines of railway before we determine to build extensions of them into the interior. If that was the purpose, it ought to be made very much clearer than it is here, in my opinion.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am sure the Senator from Iowa and myself agree as to the propriety of the construction of a railroad into the interior of Alaska. We may differ a little as to the methods by which it ought to be accomplished. I feel that the bill gives all the power that the Senator rather insists ought to be exercised. We differ, in that the Senator does not think the President of the United States ought to have that power, but thinks the matter ought to be determined in advance, while I say the President of the United States has the power, as he ought to have it, and ought to determine it after the bill has been passed, and leave it to his agents to make proper report.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KERN. May I inquire of the Senator whether he can conveniently conclude his remarks to-day?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that I can not very well do so, because I have yielded a good deal of my time to my colleagues. I can not finish inside of an hour, and perhaps not in two hours if Senators are going to keep interrupting me.

Mr. KERN. May I ask the Senator if he will be willing to yield at this time for an executive session, and conclude his remarks to-morrow?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 13, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 12, 1914.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Jesse B. Hearin, Demopolis.
B. L. Perry, Union Springs.
John C. Routon, Luverne.
Dora A. Speer, Ashland.

ARKANSAS.

William E. Brown, Nashville.
H. C. Pernot, Van Buren.
Levi B. Sharp, Black Rock.

CALIFORNIA.

F. V. Dewey, Hanford.
E. E. Drees, Petaluma.
George T. Fissell, Davis.
Emily Gavin, Concord.
T. S. Kemble, Alturas.
R. W. Lockridge, Delano.
Flora B. Reynolds, Mill Valley.
A. G. Sawin, Loyalton.
Walter Staley, Selma.

COLORADO.

R. L. Newton, Arvada.
E. C. McAnelly, Fort Collins.
Thomas McCunniff, La Jara.
Christopher C. Wilson, Goldfield.

CONNECTICUT.

Michael H. Walsh, Middletown.
Patrick H. Walsh, New Hartford.
Camilla A. Woisard, North Grosvenor Dale.

FLORIDA.

Alma P. Carmichael, Melbourne.
Corinne T. Summerlin, Fort Myers.

GEORGIA.

Annie Ard, Lumpkin.
Harvey C. Bunn, Waycross.
J. H. Cotter, Manchester.
J. M. Scott, Bainbridge.

IDAHO.

Edmund Ellsworth, jr., Rigby.
O. H. Marsh, Rupert.
P. C. O'Malley, Pocatello.

ILLINOIS.

Gus Blair, Murphysboro.
J. H. Carey, Watseka.
C. F. Cooke, Ridge Farm.
George W. Cress, Washington.
Henry Earle, Hebron.
Frank B. Huber, Antioch.
Robin Etter, Waverly.
Bernard McManus, jr., Cairo.
M. M. Morrissey, Bloomington.
Michael O'Neill, Gilman.
J. C. Reuter, Freeburg.
William W. Sweeney, Fort Sheridan.

INDIANA.

Thomas O. Beck, Lebanon.
Ray C. Fickle, Mulberry.
Austin E. Menges, Bristol.
Tilghman Ogle, Carlisle.
John Osborn, Culver.
Niles Wolf, Bourbon.

KANSAS.

Isaac Jordan Barrackman, Humboldt.
John M. Brown, Minneapolis.
J. C. Cordill, Alton.
H. C. Duckworth, Altoona.
Floyd C. Flory, Grenola.
Peter W. Jury, La Harpe.
J. M. Little, Sterling.
H. L. O'Bryan, Chetopa.
F. M. Pearl, Hiawatha.
W. O. Rigby, Topeka.
Nettie Watkins, Hope.

KENTUCKY.

G. S. Morris, La Grange.

MAINE.

Frank P. Davis, Bridgton.
F. J. Carsley, Dexter.
W. J. Eldridge, Foxcroft.
Everett P. Hanson, Gorham.
William I. Johnson, North Berwick.
Herbert L. Pinkham, Lincoln.
Otis C. Verow, South Brewer.

MARYLAND.

Clarence T. Dare, Rising Sun.
Wesley Jarrell, Greensboro.
George W. Kefauver, Middletown.

Thomas J. Linthicum, Annapolis.
John O. Murray, Hampstead.
George M. Wolfe, Forest Glen.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John R. McComb, Great Barrington.

MINNESOTA.

W. W. Stockwell, Anoka.

MISSISSIPPI.

A. S. Bell, Grenada.
Henry H. Mackey, Vicksburg.

MISSOURI.

Gertrude Brown, Auxvasse.
A. H. Davis, Seymour.
W. W. Hamilton, Granby.
W. A. Hughes, Glasgow.
Alexander McCandless, Downing.
C. C. Mitchim, De Soto.
John H. Orr, Ava.
L. E. Phleger, Caruthersville.
Francis H. Smith, Sikeston.
W. H. Ward, Bonne Terre.

NEBRASKA.

John Cain, Kenesaw.
Thomas A. Davis, Neligh.
Sadie E. Flaherty, Hyannis.
D. H. Kuhlman, Sterling.
Elizabeth McLean, Clarks.
D. C. Morgan, Plattsmouth.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Hume B. Heath, Plymouth.
William P. Nolin, Claremont.
Albert J. Richardson, Littleton.

NEW JERSEY.

Laird H. Bowers, Millington.
Joseph P. Cullen, Boonton.
John Lodge, Paulsboro.
James Norton, Hackensack.
George Lee Shaw, Franklin.
Frank C. Tomlin, Sewell.
Henry Walter, Riverside.

NEW YORK.

Augustus A. Blackledge, Nyack.
Wilbur C. Box, Lynbrook.
David E. Brett, Whitehall.
Charles E. Dempsey, Fort Covington.
Edward F. Dougherty, Tonawanda.
Clinton P. Geer, McGraw.
Arthur H. Graham, Newark Valley.
Patrick A. Hallahan, Brasher Falls.
George D. Hughes, Madrid.
William J. Hyland, Hoosick Falls.
William F. Kasting, Buffalo.
Joseph P. Kiernan, Pawling.
De Witt C. Lynde, Marathon.
Frank McMahon, Belfast.
Mark L. Mount, Hewlett.
M. J. Murray, Owego.
Joseph J. O'Reilly, Willsboro.
George M. Pierson, Maybrook.
Edward Eugene Rigney, East Bloomfield.
John W. Thorp, Brewster.
Charles A. Townsend, Millerton.

NORTH CAROLINA.

W. A. Gibson, Bryson City.
A. M. Sanders, Smithfield.

OKLAHOMA.

Andrew J. Adcock, Aline.
Leslie E. Ellis, Erick.

TENNESSEE.

Gordon B. Baird, Obion.
Joel J. Jones, Fayetteville.
J. P. Penn, Kenton.
Eugene S. Shannon, Nashville.
Elizabeth Kirby-Smith, Sewanee.

TEXAS.

Minerva E. Austin, Grapevine.
J. A. Davis, Dawson.
W. J. Davis, Silsbee.
Earl M. Duvall, Petrolia.

Robert N. Eastus, Gordon.
A. W. Howell, Frost.
J. J. Jenkins, Skidmore.
Will Ligon, Morgan.
Forrest M. Mattox, Newton.
W. L. Mount, Bellevue.
Conrad M. Newton, Hubbard.
George W. Rohleder, Eagle Pass.
R. D. Tankersley, Killeen.

UTAH.

A. Binkele, Tremonton.
James A. Faust, Delta.
Niels Lind, Midvale.
J. C. Twaddle, Sunnyside.

WASHINGTON.

Ethel R. Hanks, Port Orchard.
James H. Schneckloth, Pomeroy.

WEST VIRGINIA.

A. D. Smith, jr., Fayetteville.
Jesse D. Wilson, Fairview.

WISCONSIN.

Michael J. Rice, Kewaunee.
Frank B. Schutz, Milwaukee.

WYOMING.

R. J. McGinnis, Cody.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, January 12, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, that though the years come and go with ceaseless rapidity Thou art ever the same, upholding, sustaining, guiding Thy children in the onward march of civilization. We thank Thee for the wisdom, knowledge, and achievements which have come down to us out of the past; for the broad fields of endeavor stretching before us, inviting to yet greater attainments for the individual, the Nation, the race. May we lose no time in vain regrets for past mistakes and failures, but with increased energy and zeal do the work Thou hast given us to do to-day.

Trust no future, howe'er pleasant!
Let the dead Past bury its dead!
Act, act in the living present!
Heart within, and God o'erhead!

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of December 23, 1913, was read and approved.

REGENT OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa one of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution in place of Mr. PEPPER, deceased.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KIRKPATRICK, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. SHARP, for 10 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. CRISP, for 10 days, on account of illness.

IRVIN S. PEPPER.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a eulogy delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] at the funeral of the late Representative PEPPER at Ottumwa, Iowa, on the 26th of December last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a eulogy by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] on the life and character of the late Representative PEPPER, of Iowa, delivered at his grave. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The eulogy is as follows:

EULOGY OF JOSEPH J. RUSSELL DELIVERED AT THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE CONGRESSMAN IRVIN S. PEPPER, DECEMBER 26, 1913.

[From the Courier, Ottumwa, Iowa, December 26, 1913.]

I have been requested to say a few words in behalf of the Members of the lower House of Congress. What I shall say will be personal in their nature; I feel that it is more appropriate that they should be.

We are here by appointment of the Speaker of the House of Representatives to pay a last tribute of respect to the memory of your distinguished dead, to mingle our tears with yours, and to join with all the people of this great State in their spontaneous expressions of universal sorrow.

It was my good fortune to meet Mr. PEPPER soon after his election and before he had been sworn in or taken his seat. I was at once attracted to him by his splendid, open countenance, his natural frankness, and his generous, manly spirit, and soon thereafter I became closely attached to him as a personal friend. As our acquaintance became more intimate the ties of friendship that bound us together became stronger and stronger.

During his service in the House I met him almost daily, both officially and socially. I knew his ambitions and he knew mine. Our mutual confidences and our mutual sympathies, it seemed to me, gave vitality to our ambition and strength to the hope of the future success of us both. The last day that he spent in Washington we took dinner together, and he advised me at the time of his contemplated trip to this, the State that he loved so much, and the purposes of his mission.

Soon afterwards I learned that he was seriously sick with a dreadful disease, and I frequently inquired of his secretary of his condition. On last Friday, one week ago to-day, I was informed that he was out of danger, and went at once to my office and wrote him a brief letter congratulating him upon the information which I had received. That letter, I am now informed, was read to him by his brother or sister on the last day of his life. In my letter at that time I addressed him as "My dear Pep," a term which to-day, when I speak in his presence as he sleeps in death, might seem disrespectful, but it was not so then; it was to his associates in Washington a term of endearment, and one that was inspired by the warmest personal friendship.

On Saturday, the following morning, his secretary showed to me a telegram stating that our friend had suffered a relapse and was much worse. I at once felt that this was the beginning of the end, knowing as I did of his long and serious sickness, and of his necessarily weakened physical condition. On the following Monday morning when the sad message came announcing his death, and when the official flag was hung at half mast, it seemed to me that a cloud of gloom at once covered the Capital City, and I know that a feeling of sadness filled the hearts of all who knew him.

Two weeks ago to-day a bill was under consideration in the House which carried an item for a pension for the deserving widow of an old Union soldier in Mr. PEPPER's district. An amendment was offered and an effort made to strike that item from the bill. I at once rose in my place to resist the amendment, stating to the House that this item in the bill was introduced by Mr. PEPPER, who was at that time in his home State seriously sick, and as he was not able to speak for himself I desired to speak for him. I defended the item, the amendment was defeated, and the item remained in the bill and was approved and passed by the House. It will be a great satisfaction to me till the day of my death to remember that I seized this opportunity, the last one that I could ever have during his life, to do him a personal favor. Knowing him and his loyal friendship as I did, I am perfectly conscious of the fact that if the circumstances had been reversed he would have done as much for me.

On one occasion when his beloved father, who is now stricken with grief, was visiting his son in Washington, upon his invitation and request I went with him and his father to Alexandria, Va., where we attended the Masonic Lodge over which George Washington once presided as its master. I now remember very distinctly of the appropriate and beautiful remarks that Mr. PEPPER made on that occasion, expressing his devotion to the Masonic Order and to its teachings. He believed, as all Masons believe, that—

It is not all of life to live,
Nor all of death to die.

I trust that it will not be inappropriate to-day to refer to one of the teachings of this honorable and venerable institution, that of the immortality of the soul. Our Masonic brethren compare human life to the hour glass. Behold how the little particles contained in that instrument slowly and almost imperceptibly pass away, and yet in one short hour they are all exhausted. So wastes man; to-day he puts forth the tender buds of hope, to-morrow he blushes and blooms and bears his honors thick upon him; the next day a chilling frost destroys all, and when he thinks his greatness is still aspiring he falls like autumn leaves to enrich our mother earth.

This thought would be dark and gloomy were it not for our belief in immortality, but we are also taught and believe that

there is in man a divine spark which bears a close affinity with the Supreme Architect of the universe which shall never die. This enables us to look forward with hope and confidence to a blessed immortality.

In the cemetery at Columbia, Mo., where the university of that State is located, the monument at the grave of Dr. Read, an ex-president of the university, bears this inscription: "I tried to do my duty." These were the last words spoken by him. I think that I may with propriety appropriate these words to-day expressive of the life and efforts of our departed friend whose mortal remains now sleep before us. I know, and every Member of Congress knows, that he tried to do his duty and succeeded well.

In conclusion permit me to say to his father and his surviving brothers and sisters, you have lost a jewel from your family circle, but it should be some consolation to know that he has left to you the priceless inheritance of a spotless name. The people of the district that he represented have lost a useful and an able Representative in Congress, one who was devoted to them and a tireless worker for the interests and the welfare of those who had honored and trusted him. The American Congress has lost an active, an influential, and a beloved Member. This the great State of Iowa has lost one of its purest and most promising public men. The country has lost an honest, an efficient, and a faithful public servant.

May he rest in peace until we shall meet and greet him again in a better and a brighter world in that spirit land beyond the grave.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8142. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, at or near Wilmot, Ark.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 11003. An act to provide for expenses of representatives of the United States at the international maritime conference for safety of life at sea; and

H. R. 7837. An act to provide for the establishment of Federal reserve banks, to furnish an elastic currency, to afford means of rediscounting commercial paper, to establish a more effective supervision of banking in the United States, and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10523, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HULL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 10523. A bill making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose an amendment was pending, which, without objection, the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 44, after line 17, insert:

"No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be paid to any person employed under or in connection with the public schools of the District of Columbia who shall solicit or receive, or permit to be solicited or received on any public-school premises, any subscription or donation of money or other thing of value from pupils enrolled in such public schools for presentation of testimonials, or for any other purposes other than for the promotion of school athletics, school gardens, and commencement exercises of high schools."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to that.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute is not in order until the point of order is disposed of.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order was made against the amendment when we were in session before and was overruled, and the amendment was held to be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the point of order was not acted upon.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman state the ground of his point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. My ground is that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not in order under the rule.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is merely a limitation on the expenditure of money that is carried for the purpose of conducting the school. Because of the fact that it is a mere limitation it is in order, and I think that the Record will show that the Chairman of the committee ruled that the amendment was in order on the last day that the bill was under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the proposed amendment proposes such a limitation on the appropriation as would bring it within the rule. The point of order is therefore overruled.

Mr. McCOY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 44, at the end of line 23, after the word "testimonials," add the words "charitable gifts," and at the end of line 24 add the words "not having strictly to do with school activities."

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment as I have proposed it I think leaves the section so that it meets all the committee had in mind in framing the legislation which they proposed in the bill. In other words, it prevents the solicitation in schools for gifts of money to be used for purposes other than for school purposes. I think that the purpose of the legislation suggested in the bill was a proper purpose, although I think also that the scope of the legislation was entirely too broad.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOY. I will.

Mr. MURDOCK. What abuses have there been that this legislation seeks to correct; what funds have been solicited at the schools?

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, I understand that in some cases, even this fall, collections have been taken up in the public schools to make gifts to the poor of the District at Thanksgiving time, and on a recent occasion funds were being solicited for the presentation of a testimonial. I think that such solicitation of funds in the schools should not be permitted, but I do think—and I believe that the chairman of the subcommittee agrees with me—that it ought to be possible to solicit in the public schools subscriptions for such things as the school papers or for theatrical performances the proceeds of which are to be used for athletic purposes and playgrounds.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the gentleman's substitute accomplishes that?

Mr. McCOY. My substitute prevents the kind of solicitation which I believe is objectionable—that is, for purposes outside of school activities; but it permits the solicitation of contributions for strictly school activities, the activities of the pupils.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, and I was just about to say so when the committee rose the day before Congress adjourned for the holiday recess. Outside of the general proposition, I am opposed to it on account of the penalty that is attached. The penalty provides that no teacher shall have any of the money appropriated by this act if a collection is taken in violation of the terms of that particular section. For instance, if some teacher should, in an unguarded moment, permit a collection to be taken to help out some boy who had suffered from an accident, then she or he, the teacher, could not receive any of the money appropriated by this act. In other words, the job would be entirely forfeited, not for one month but for the remainder of the term, until more money had been appropriated.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the substitute proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McCoy] is adopted, it will not be a limitation, but will be substantially in the phraseology incorporated in the appropriation bill under consideration, so that the argument of the gentleman is not applicable at all.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the amendment to the amendment entirely eliminate the penalty?

Mr. STAFFORD. Entirely so.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, if the amendment eliminates the penalty, the only objection I have to it is the general objection. I am, of course, in favor of the amendment to the amendment as improving the original suggestion of the committee, but I am opposed to the whole proposition, because I do not believe that it is the proper function of this Congress to legislate on those minor school provisions. I believe that the school board here ought to make those regulations, and that if they can not in

the District of Columbia make regulations as to whether collections shall be taken or not, they certainly have not enough ability to run the schools. Congress ought not to burden the Federal statutes with a whole lot of minute regulations about these minor affairs. I believe that the matter of collections and whether collections should be taken ought to be left to the board.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, if we are to make this limitation upon the school-teachers, why not include the police force and the Congress itself and everyone else?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion is a good one. If we limit the school-teachers in this way by congressional act, if this is a subject large enough to entertain the attention of Congress, then why should we not provide that policemen shall not take collections and that Members of Congress shall not? I think it is absurd to bring this matter before Congress, to attempt to put on the Federal statutes a provision in reference to these collections. During the last session, just before Christmas, my two little children came in with envelopes, in which they were going to put some money. It was not compulsory. It was for the poor; for those who were not going to get any presents. Every one of the school children had been given an envelope, and they were to bring the envelopes back and drop them in a hat, and no one could tell whether there was money in them or not. The child could seal the envelope and drop it in the hat, where everyone was to return the envelope, and there would be no way of telling whether the child who could not donate had failed to donate or not. I do not think that hurt anything or anybody. I think it taught the children a good lesson. I insist that it ought to be left to the school board to say whether or not these collections should be taken. But as for this almost inhuman penalty proposed of sacrificing the job of a teacher or a principal who permits a collection, I have no patience whatever with the suggestion. The dispenser of the public funds will not know whether to pay any teacher the salary due till he learns whether there has been any collections taken, and in case some grouchy person complains that a collection has been taken, he will be justified in holding up the warrants for every teacher on the premises, from principal down through the grades, and I suppose the janitor also would become involved.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from New Jersey, if I may have his attention. I was unable to hear the reading of his amendment and unable to get his explanation. Is it sufficiently broad to exempt from the operation of this amendment the school garden work and the athletics? Will he state again just what his amendment provides? State it for the benefit of all.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio asked what my amendment proposes to do and whether it would permit certain activities. The amendment is to substitute, after the word "testimonials," in line 23, the words "charitable gifts," and at the end of line 24 the words "not having strictly to do with school activities." It was my purpose to draw it so that it would be sufficiently broad to include permission to collect for the sort of thing of which the gentleman from Ohio speaks and has in mind, which I think, is a school activity.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree with the gentleman in his opinion, and I think his amendment will cover that.

Mr. McCOY. I think that it will.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, for the reason that if it is adopted we might as well not legislate at all in connection with this matter. In my judgment, the phraseology of the substitute offered by him will leave the gap stand as it is now for the solicitation of subscriptions for any purpose, because the term "school activities" is a matter that would be determined largely by the teacher in the school, and they could name anything on the face of the earth as being a school activity, and there would be no check whatever put upon what your committee has regarded as an abuse in the solicitation of subscriptions from the children in the public schools.

Mr. McCOY. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. McCOY. Suppose the proposed substitute were changed so as to read "the activities of the scholars of the school"? Would that make any difference?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That may make it somewhat better, Mr. Chairman, but it is very hard, indeed, to state what could or could not be done under any amendment, and if we are going to do anything we ought to do something that is effective in checking what your committee regards as an abuse in the public schools. Now, the Congress of the United States has protected the employees of the Government in every department from the abuse of solicitation, just as we are trying to protect

the school children in the District of Columbia, and I can see no reason why the language of the amendment pending, the committee amendment, should not be adopted, nor can I see any harm that will come to the legitimate activities of the school by its adoption.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not have the RECORD before me, and I do not recall the fact of whether the gentleman accepted the amendment I proposed as to school gardens.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The amendment as it is now proposed, the committee amendment, includes other than for the promotion of school athletics, school gardens, and commencement exercises of high schools. I think that leaves open every legitimate channel for the solicitation of contributions from the children in the schools.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to know why the gentleman makes those exceptions?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Those exceptions are made for reasons which were presented by certain members of the Committee of the Whole—that it was impossible, so far as the commencement exercises were concerned in the high schools, to carry them out, as there was no provision of law made for certain small expenses, and that the members of the graduating classes or their friends could make contributions for certain activities in connection with those graduating exercises.

Mr. SHERLEY. What suggested itself to my mind was this basic proposition: That whatever of this nature ought to be done in a public school ought to be done at the public expense, and that we ought, in abolishing an abuse, abolish the whole abuse.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I agree entirely with the principle that the gentleman suggests.

Mr. McCOY. Then will the gentleman from Kentucky be willing that there should be an appropriation for all these things included in the bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; because some of them ought not to exist at all. But I would be willing to have an appropriation made for every legitimate thing. I speak with some knowledge of the matter. I think I know something of the public schools. I went from the lowest grade to the highest in my city in obtaining an education; I have been in touch with public-school matters in my city, and I know the abuses that arise by virtue of subscriptions to promote some particular pet hobby of some particular person.

Mr. McCOY. If the chairman of the committee will permit me, suppose the pupils wish to get up a theatrical entertainment for the purpose of raising funds to run their baseball nine or their football eleven. What about that?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is nothing that can be written in this law that will prevent pupils on their own initiative, among themselves, doing anything they see fit to do. But what is being aimed at here is using the pupil and making him seem to take the initiative when in point of fact he is simply following the suggestion of somebody else.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No. I must insist that I have the floor for a moment for one observation that I have to make. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts a little later. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the membership of this committee that, in my judgment, there can be no worse practice in connection with the public-school system than the solicitation within the schools of these subscriptions for various purposes. Why, it developed in the hearings before your subcommittee that they solicited subscriptions for purely charitable purposes, the funds being turned over to the Board of Charities, the Associated Charities of the District of Columbia, to be dispensed, the contributions being solicited from children who themselves in many instances were proper objects of charity, embarrassing them by their inability to contribute when their fellows were contributing.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCOY. Would not the proposed substitute cure that very thing?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I can not say it would cure it, because then the school authorities might say that the solicitation of funds for charitable purposes was a school activity.

Mr. McCOY. But, then, my amendment says that it shall not be permitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether the language in the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McCoy] accomplishes the purpose intended, but I believe that the gentleman is in sympathy with the effort on the part of the committee to provide a remedy for a real abuse, and one that should be corrected without delay.

I sincerely hope that in haggling over the specific language that is to go into the law the Members of the House will not lose sight of the fact that this abuse does exist and should be corrected. It is not merely in the schools, but it is in every organized work of any nature, public or private. When the superintendent of a great railway corporation resigns or is transferred, or when the manager of a great commercial enterprise resigns or goes to some other occupation, collections are made to present him with a testimonial. Many people contribute to these things who do not feel that they are able to do it and who ought not to be made to do it, as they are, by the compulsion of the sentiment which surrounds them. I can not believe, I regret to say, that the new association which is cutting some figure now in the newspapers, at least, commonly called the "Spugs," affords the relief that ought to be had, but there ought to be some relief, and I believe there ought to be a general mandate of law forbidding the solicitation of contributions for testimonials of any kind for anybody with respect to everything and place on which we have the authority to legislate.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. I suppose the gentleman from Texas has had experience, when a classmate in one of the grades died, for instance, and they would take up a collection of 10, 15, or 20 cents apiece to buy a floral wreath?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Under this provision, if a teacher were to permit that, she would lose her job?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I think not. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky absolutely and conclusively answers that. No statute can forbid me as an individual to give what I please of my own funds. It is the organized soliciting by the compulsion of the organization which surrounds the individual at the moment that is objectionable.

Mr. BRYAN. But the amendment discharges a teacher if she permits it on the premises. Furthermore, how is the man who pays the salary or draws the warrant going to know? Is he going to require an affidavit from each teacher before he issues the warrant?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have thought that the gentle command of the law would prevent the teacher doing that, without any penalty whatever. I hope some law in line with the suggestion of the committee will be enacted.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he sees any impropriety or any harm coming from the school children editing, managing, and publishing a school paper, and soliciting among their schoolmates contributions or subscriptions to that paper on school property.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I see nothing in the amendment I have offered to prevent that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The last six words in line 24 will prevent that. They can not solicit money for the presentation of testimonials or for any other purpose.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes. Any person employed in, or in connection with, the public schools is forbidden to do that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. But those people, employed in or in connection with the public schools, can not permit anybody else to solicit on school property, under the language of the amendment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. There is nothing that keeps any child from making his contribution.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. But the gentleman understands that in getting the subscriptions to their school paper they do it on school property.

I know in one of the high schools of Washington the pupils publish a magazine, which comes out, I think, monthly, and they solicit their schoolmates to subscribe to and maintain the school publication, and they do it on school property. Now, I see no harm whatever in that. I do recognize an abuse such as the gentleman has pointed out, but here is something that I can not think anybody will look upon as an abuse. Yet under the language of this amendment, on page 44, the teacher who

permitted the children to solicit subscriptions to a school magazine or school paper would be violating the mandate of Congress.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will simply say to the gentleman that I do not care to say that I personally see any harm in the activity he has outlined, and I do say that it need not necessarily be stopped by the language of this amendment. It may be done somewhere else than on the school premises, and if it is worthy of being done there will be a way found by which these school children can do it, not in violation of this amendment, and that it is impossible to specify in the language of the amendment all the exceptions that might suggest themselves to the minds of gentlemen of the committee.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I do not agree with the gentleman on that. I believe it is very easy to point out in your amendment the class of abuse you are seeking to prevent. It is an extremely easy thing to do, and not have such broad language. This language will prevent things that I myself believe are most desirable for the school children to be engaged in.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that the very case he puts can be made an abuse, and if you allow a wide latitude, frequently it will be abused; whereas if you leave it simply a matter of individual initiative there will be no difficulty about it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman point out wherein there is any abuse in soliciting a subscription for a school publication?

Mr. SHERLEY. There could be plenty of abuse. It is not every scholar who possibly can subscribe, nor does every scholar like to be put in the attitude of being one of a few who do not subscribe.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The pupils do not know who subscribe and who do not.

Mr. SHERLEY. I can imagine a kind of solicitation that would be not only objectionable but highly wrong.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. According to the chairman of the committee [Mr. PAGE of North Carolina], that solicitation can still be carried on just outside of the school premises.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is a good deal of difference between individual initiative that comes from one outside and action that comes in the school, from the school as a center.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. This is not done in school hours. It is done in the recess or before or after school hours, on school property.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the provision in the bill, as amended by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], will be adopted. The necessity for this legislation arises out of the fact that it has come to be the practice in some of the schools of the District to make collections for the presentation of testimonials, and in some cases collections for charitable and semicharitable purposes.

Now, many of these purposes are excellent, many of them are proper, and many of the parents of the children would be glad to make the contributions. The practice, however, is, as a general proposition, not a good one; a serious objection to it is that the solicitation of these contributions may seriously embarrass and humiliate those children in the public schools whose parents can not afford such contributions.

I have four children attending the schools in the District. I have been glad to give to my children the small sums that have been solicited from time to time, but I realize the fact that there are many parents so situated that it would be difficult for them to make these contributions, and the children who do not make them are necessarily humiliated and necessarily embarrassed among their fellow students.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman from Wyoming; but has not the school board authority to correct this evil?

Mr. MONDELL. I think so; and it ought not to be necessary to do it by legislation, but it seems to be necessary, and therefore we are doing it.

Mr. MURDOCK. How is it over the United States throughout the cities and towns? Is it not prohibited by school-board regulations?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it is largely done by the town council, and we are the town council.

Mr. BRYAN. The town council does not do it, but the school directors.

Mr. MONDELL. I thank the gentleman for the correction, but we are the school directors of the District.

Mr. McCOY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. McCOY. I do not know whether the gentleman heard the substitute that I proposed.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I did; but I do not think the substitute, while I have personally no objection to it, is as good as the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. I think his amendment is better because it is more specific, and it accepts these particular classes of contributions which the children may very properly be asked to participate in, namely, those having to do with school athletics and the school gardens. That includes practically every activity I now think of that the children ought to be asked to contribute to. I fear that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McCoy] would leave the matter so largely to the discretion of the authorities that it might have no effect whatever.

Mr. McCOY. Could not we try it for one year?

Mr. MONDELL. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is better.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. It has been brought to my attention that the language proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina would include the collections for laboratory matters and lockers, and matters of that kind. Does not the gentleman think that would be a dangerous prohibition?

Mr. MONDELL. I am not so sure in regard to that, but there has been something of an abuse and an attempt is made to remedy it, and I think the provisions here in the language proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina covers about all the activities that it is necessary to cover, perhaps there are others.

Mr. WILLIS. Does not the gentleman think the language proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey embodies exactly what he has in mind—"in having strictly to do with school activities." That is what the gentleman wants, is it not?

Mr. MONDELL. Possibly so, but it is pretty general. I should be afraid that the school-teacher inclined to ignore the law might believe that under that his or her authority was pretty wide. I ascribe nothing but the best of motives to those who have approved such contributions. They may not have realized the objection to the practice I have referred to.

Mr. BRYAN. Does not the gentleman think that a penalty of absolute discharge of the teacher, the losing of her position or his position permanently, is an entirely unreasonable and unfair penalty?

Mr. MONDELL. Such a penalty would be severe, but they ought not to violate a plain provision of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired; all time has expired, and the question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PAGE of North Carolina) there were 16 ayes and 68 noes. So the substitute was lost.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCOY. Is it too late to move to strike out the last word? I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SISSON. I make the point of order that it is too late.

Mr. McCOY. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs in regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. McCOY. I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

Mr. SISSON. I make the point that it is too late to strike out the last word, because they have voted down the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey moves to strike out the last word of the amendment, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before voting on this amendment proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] I hope that the committee will have clearly in mind exactly what it does. It provides in substance, though not in so many words, that a teacher who permits the solicitation of funds upon school premises shall thereby be barred from receiving any money under this bill.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SISSON. Does the ruling of the Chairman reopen debate on this matter? I would like to know exactly where we stand, because this matter will come up during the entire proceedings while the present occupant of the chair is in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey, in the opinion of the Chair, had the right, when the question came up on agreeing to the original amendment, to move to strike out the last word. The committee has charge of the question of limiting debate.

Mr. MCCOY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the strenuous attempt of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] to shut me off shows that he is convinced—

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to cut the gentleman off or to cut off any other gentleman, providing he is in order; but I do not believe, notwithstanding the decision of the Chair, that that was not the rule prior to the time the distinguished occupant of the chair made that ruling; but it is the rule now.

Mr. MCCOY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman realizes fully the seriousness of the objection to the proposed amendment. Personally, I should prefer that the bill stand as it is, bad as I think it is, rather than to have this amendment adopted, because, as I stated previously, if any teacher in a public school through inadvertence or otherwise, or failure to observe closely enough what was going on, should permit a pupil of that school to solicit a contribution for the school newspaper, should permit the pupil to solicit anybody to purchase a ticket for some theatricals that were to be given in the school, or for any of the hundred and one things that the pupils rightly do, that teacher would lose an entire year's salary.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MCCOY. Certainly.

Mr. ASWELL. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is it not a fact that this practice prevails in every part of the country?

Mr. MCCOY. So far as I know.

Mr. ASWELL. And in every town of the country?

Mr. MCCOY. That is true.

Mr. ASWELL. And is it not a further fact that the purpose of public education is to provide citizenship, and is it not a good thing for those children to participate in the charities about them, and is it not a fact that it is a most remarkable thing that this Congress should take time here this morning to legislate upon a matter so insignificant as that? I think it is an outrage. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the objection the gentleman raises in respect to the penalty imposed for a violation of the law, it strikes me that if an abuse is worth preventing at all it ought to be prevented, and the only way to prevent it is to place a penalty which will make those in authority observe the law as it is written by Congress.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. ASWELL. Why does the gentleman confine this to the schools? Why does he not include all of the public officials?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It is not confined to the schools. I made that statement awhile ago.

Mr. ASWELL. Is the gentleman prohibiting subscriptions from Members of Congress in their offices?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The law forbids the solicitation of subscriptions from the employees of the departments in every department of the Government.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman think that Congress can prohibit that sort of thing?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Or on the Capitol Grounds, for that matter, and I think that would include Members of Congress, if the gentleman cared to pursue the matter further.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Would the chairman of the subcommittee agree to cut out, on line 20, the words "or permit to be solicited or received"?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; because I believe that would destroy absolutely the purpose of the amendment. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McCoy] says that he would prefer the original language of the bill. Your committee offered the original language of the bill, and a point of order was made to it from that side of the House. We therefore sought to write it so that it would not be subject to a point of order, and we have done it in this way because it was necessary to do it in order to escape the point of order and carry it in the bill.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman I ask for a vote—does the gentleman have some further observation?

Mr. FESS. One more question.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. All right; one more question.

Mr. FESS. Does not the gentleman think that he is placing a limitation here that ought to be placed by the school board?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, I say to the gentleman frankly, yes; but the school board does not exercise the authority that it ought to exercise in these matters, and therefore Congress must do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted—

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I make the motion to strike out the last three words.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, is that in order?

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, in answer to what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Aswell] said, the Government has protected every department in the Government, has protected the Members of Congress here in the Capitol Grounds, and the public schools happen to be the only department of Government that is not protected from this sort of evil—

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson (continuing). And it is for that reason we believe that this ought to go into this bill.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not a common practice in the gentleman's own town that subscriptions are thus taken up? Has the gentleman ever tried to prohibit it at home, and is it not a common practice?

Mr. Sisson. The difference is that I am not on the school board in my town. I have not any duties to perform there, but I do have one to perform here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. ASWELL) there were—ayes 59, noes 17.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For instruction of indigent blind children of the District of Columbia, in Maryland or some other State, under a contract to be entered into by the commissioners, \$7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 46, line 9, the word "indigent."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 46, line 9, by striking out the word "indigent."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in 1857 Congress incorporated the Columbia Institution for the education of the deaf, dumb, and blind and treated the whole subject of education of these unfortunates as a charity. It provided in its legislation from that time down until 1901 for the education of the indigent deaf, dumb, and blind. In other words, while public money is appropriated for the education of children generally of the citizens and no taint of pauperism was ever attached to that public education, yet when you come to the case of the unfortunates, the deaf, the dumb, and the blind, in order to receive any benefits from public funds in the way of education they must declare themselves paupers. It seems to me it is a serious enough handicap to any person to be afflicted either with deafness, dumbness, or blindness, one that should give them the advantages and benefits of public education without compelling them or their parents to declare themselves paupers. However, Congress treated these unfortunates down to 1901 as paupers if they were to get any benefit from the appropriation made for their education. In 1901 a glimmer of light and reason and common sense seemed to strike the Congress, because in the act of that year it removed this stigma of pauperism from the deaf and dumb, so that from 1901 down to the present time the deaf and dumb can have the advantage of public appropriations of money and be educated in the Columbia Institution without the parents or the parties themselves declaring pauperism. Now, since the stigma of pauperism was removed from those who are to receive the benefits of this public appropriation we have provided for the education of colored deaf mutes at public expense, and I want to point out to the committee and to the chairman of the subcommittee that when we provided for the education at public expense of colored deaf mutes we did not attach to it the stigma of pauperism, but we still leave that stigma attached to the white blind, who want to get the benefit of education at public expense, and it seems to me the time has come when we should remove from this class of unfortunates the humiliation of pauperism before they can get the advantage of this small appropriation of \$7,000.

Now, I want to say to the committee and to the chairman of the subcommittee that the whole treatment of the education of the blind has undergone and is now undergoing rapidly a wonderful change throughout the country. We have come to realize that this class of people have a brain that is capable of

education, and by that education making the possessor of the brain self-supporting and bringing a great ray of light and happiness to the lives of those who are, perhaps, the most unfortunate of all the three classes that have been mentioned; and it seems to me that now is the time when Congress should remove any imputation of pauperism from these unfortunate blind who wish to take advantage of this \$7,000 appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the purpose that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] has in view in offering the amendment to this bill, which is that the blind children of the District of Columbia or of any other political subdivision should have help toward their education at public expense.

As chairman of this subcommittee, and as a member of it, I am not familiar with the law authorizing this appropriation in the beginning, and since the question has arisen I have tried to find in the law the authority for the appropriation but have not found it. I therefore would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has at hand the law authorizing originally this appropriation?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I can get it for the gentleman in a very few minutes, if the gentleman will pardon me a moment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The origin of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind is, briefly, as follows: In 1857 Amos Kendall, who had—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I want to say to the gentleman that I am perfectly familiar with that particular phase of the question—the bequest of Mr. Kendall.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will pardon me a moment, that is the beginning. Amos Kendall gave over a certain amount of property here in the District of Columbia for the education of the deaf, dumb, and blind, on condition that the property be maintained by public appropriations or by private charity, and for a period of some six or seven years Congress, beginning in 1858, appropriated money for the employment of teachers and the payment of incidental expenses of that institution, and the institution educated the deaf, dumb, and blind. Then, after the expiration of some six or seven years, by act of Congress the blind were excluded from the Columbia Institution, and what is called an indefinite appropriation was made for the education of the indigent blind, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior. The indigent blind, under the act, were to be educated in an institution in Maryland or in some other State.

From that period down to 1889—that is, from about 1865 down to 1889—this expense of education of the indigent blind was borne by the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. In just a moment. In 1889, by act of March 2 of that year, one-half of that expense was placed on the District and the other half was to be borne by the Treasury. That is, for the education of the indigent blind. It was called an indefinite appropriation, because the Secretary of the Interior could send as many children as he saw fit to this institution, or some other, and pay whatever the expense might be.

The half-and-half plan was continued from 1889 down to 1908. The act of May 26, 1908, repealed the indefinite appropriation, so called, and appropriated \$6,000 for the purpose of educating these indigent blind. Six thousand dollars was appropriated for one or two years following, and in the third session of the Sixty-second Congress the appropriation was increased to \$7,000. That is the amount that is carried this year. So that the indefinite appropriation continued from somewhere about 1864 or 1865 down to 1908, when the indefinite feature was repealed and a fixed appropriation was inserted in the law. I can give the gentleman the exact date that the indefinite appropriation began if he will give me time to look into my notes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the law under which we are now operating provides only for an appropriation for the indigent blind. Does the gentleman admit that?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. So far as that has been the law for indigent blind, yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is the law.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent for an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I think the chairman of the committee desired to ask me a question.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I wanted to elicit from the gentleman whether or not he admitted that the statute now provides that an appropriation shall be made for the indigent blind? I ask the gentleman that, having reference to the reservation of the point of order against his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I do not admit that. I think as a matter of fact there is no basic law. From all my examination—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will permit me, in the Revised Statutes, second edition, on page 942, he will find that there is a law. Section 4869 of the Revised Statutes reads as follows:

Whenever the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied by evidence produced by the president of the Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb that any blind person of teachable age can not command the means to secure an education, he may cause such person to be instructed in some institution for the education of the blind in Maryland or some other State at a cost not greater for each pupil than is or may be for the time being paid by such State, and to cause the same to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

That is the law.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Admitting, if the gentleman please, that that is the law, wherein does the gentleman think there is any harm in striking out that feature "indigent" from the law? What hardship is to be imposed on the Federal Government or the District of Columbia, and why should we not, as we can very properly, change the law by striking out the word "indigent"?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will allow me, I think the objection is that it shifts the burden from the parent of a blind child to the Government.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is just what I am getting at, and I shall in a moment offer another amendment which will make it apparent here in the District of Columbia that there is a duty on the public to educate these blind children just as much as there is a duty on the part of the public to educate the deaf and dumb or to educate those who have normal faculties.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think they do educate the deaf and dumb.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. But let me tell the gentleman that it is only since 1908 that we have educated the deaf and dumb without making them declare themselves paupers. The whole thing started in the education of the deaf, dumb, and blind, and they were considered and treated as paupers down to 1908, when, for some reason, that stigma of pauperism was removed from the deaf and dumb, but Congress failed to remove it from the blind, because, I think, it was done in an appropriation for the Columbia Institute, which did not have blind children among its pupils.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, I am not mistaken about that.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. As to the removing of the word "indigent" from the deaf and dumb?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No; I am not mistaken there. If the gentleman will look—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will refer to section 4864 of the Revised Statutes, he will find that the law applying to the deaf and dumb is also that they shall be those who are indigent and their parents unable to pay.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will look at the act passed on March 1, 1901, which is found in Thirty-first Statutes at Large, page 844, he will see that that act provides specifically that hereafter deaf mutes of teachable age, of good mental capacity, and properly belonging to the District of Columbia, shall be received and instructed in said institution, their admission thereto being subject to the approval of the superintendent of public schools of the District of Columbia, and said institution shall not be regarded nor classified as an institution of charity.

Prior to that all the appropriations for the deaf and dumb—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will allow me, that only regulates admission and puts it in the hands of the superintendent, and the purpose was to get it out of the hands of somebody else.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman is wrong, because the deaf and dumb go in there now without being declared paupers.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina makes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, after line 12, insert the following paragraph: "For instruction of blind children in the public schools of the District of Columbia, \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I stated a moment ago, the whole theory of the education of unfortunate children—deaf and dumb and blind—has undergone a radical change throughout the United States. The subject matter has been agitated since 1866, when Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, of the Perkins Institution for the Blind, in Massachusetts, advocated the education of the blind children in public schools at public expense. In 1902 Frank H. Hall, then superintendent for the blind of Jacksonville, Ill., urged the board to teach the blind children with the seeing children, and the matter was agitated for some 10 years in the State of Illinois, until 1900, when the city of Chicago, the first community in the United States to adopt the plan, opened three public schools for the education of the blind with the seeing children. Since that time the public education of the blind in public schools has been adopted in Cincinnati in 1905, in Milwaukee in 1907, in Racine in 1909, in Cleveland in 1909, in Newark, N. J., in 1910, and in Jersey City in 1911.

In the year 1913, in the city of Washington, this matter was taken up by those interested in the subject with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and with the board of education and Dr. Davidson, then superintendent of schools, and all agreed that the blind of the District should be educated in the public schools at public expense.

I am advised that a recommendation has been made for a deficiency appropriation of \$1,000 to prepare for the work of educating the blind and supplying the teachers, for the reason that the appropriation under which the school board at present is working was not sufficient to permit of that expenditure, in order that the work might be taken up in the District immediately. This bill we are now considering, of course, provides for the next fiscal year.

The school authorities, the Commissioners of the District, the superintendent of schools, all agree here in the District that we should educate the blind with the sighted children and that it should be done at the public expense, and the amendment I have offered is merely to provide the money to carry out that purpose in the next fiscal year. I certainly hope that this committee will look upon this class of unfortunates with open minds and sympathetic hearts and will give them equal opportunity with the sighted children.

Why should we pick out the most unfortunate class of people in our community and make them educate themselves at their own expense, or declare themselves paupers, when we take all the children who have normal faculties and educate them at public expense? What good reason can any person give me for that discrimination? For God's sake, is it not handicap enough on a person—man, woman, or child, or the parents of that child—to be afflicted with blindness, deafness, or dumbness, without compelling that child or the parents to provide the whole education out of their own funds? And especially so when his next-door neighbor may be the child of a millionaire or the child of a pauper and receiving the best instruction that the public school can give at public expense. Is it not worth while to try to make these blind people self-supporting and provide them with the means of earning a livelihood, without leaving them forever shrouded in darkness and ignorance? I hope the members of the committee will see that this is but a simple act of justice to that most unfortunate class of people in our community. I hope the amendment as offered will be adopted.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I am not only myself, but the members of the committee, and I take it every gentleman in the House, are in sympathy with the modern movement for the education of the blind, deaf, and dumb children in any community; but inasmuch as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts does not, in my judgment, in any degree meet the necessities of the case, if any necessity exists, I make the point of order that I reserved against his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. What is the point of order? Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That it is not authorized by law.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. This is an appropriation bill that provides for the public instruction of children. It seems to me that it is perfectly proper on this bill to provide for the wants of children who may be blind, deaf, or dumb, and as to how they shall be educated.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the Chair will permit me, I have called attention as to what classes of children under the law shall be appropriated for at public expense.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SLAYDEN). The Chair is unable to find any law which provides for the instruction of these children at the public expense or that authorizes their education, and the Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, preceding the amendment now in the hands of the Clerk, by the addition of the words:

Provided, That no portion of the money herein appropriated for public education shall be expended unless \$1,000, or so much as may be necessary, shall be expended for the education of blind children in the public schools.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit that that is not a limitation, and I make the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts will report his amendment in writing.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I make the point of order against the amendment, that that does not make it in order, nor is it a limitation upon this appropriation, because it is in the face of express law, which is substantive law, and therefore is not in order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Wherein does it change the substantive law?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It changes substantive law. In that the law now provides that only indigent blind children shall be appropriated for.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The law does not forbid the education of other children. There is no law forbidding that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts must submit his amendment in writing.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina if he will pass this provision until I can write out the amendment?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered will be passed for the present. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Major and superintendent, \$4,000; assistant superintendent, with rank of inspector, \$2,500; 3 inspectors, at \$1,800 each; 11 captains, at \$1,500 each; chief clerk, who shall also be property clerk, \$2,000; clerk and stenographer, \$1,500; clerk, who shall be assistant property clerk, \$1,200; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 4 surgeons of the police and fire departments, at \$720 each; additional compensation for 20 privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, \$4,800, or so much thereof as may be necessary; 13 lieutenants, 1 of whom shall be harbor master, at \$1,320 each; 46 sergeants, 1 of whom may be detailed for duty in the harbor patrol, at \$1,250 each; 477 privates of class 3, at \$1,200 each; 107 privates of class 2, at \$1,080 each; 56 privates of class 1, at \$900 each; amount required to pay salaries of privates of class 2 who will be promoted to class 3 and privates of class 1 who will be promoted to class 2 during the fiscal year 1915, \$4,881.53; 6 telephone operators, at \$720 each; 14 janitors, at \$600 each; messengers—1 \$700, 1 \$600; inspector, mounted, \$240; 55 captains, lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted, at \$240 each; 64 lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted on bicycles, at \$50 each; 18 drivers, at \$720 each; 3 police matrons, at \$600 each, to possess police power of arrest; in all, \$915,201.53.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read. It is to correct the text of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 47, line 15, strike out the sum "\$915,201.53" and insert in lieu thereof the sum "\$907,101.53."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if this law provides for any additional policemen?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It does not.

Mr. MADDEN. Just the number that is provided for in the current appropriation law?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think exactly the number; and it is the allowance recommended by the commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, before we passed the item relating to the public schools it was my purpose to make a few observations, but the item was passed rather unexpectedly to me, and I would like to make them now. This bill provides \$450,000 for the continuation of work on the Central High School building. The limit of cost for that building is \$1,200,000; \$300,000 was provided in the current law. My understanding is that the plans and specifications for that building are now prepared and that the commissioners are ready to advertise for bids, with a view of beginning construction work. In this condition of affairs an effort is being made, I am told—in fact, a bill has been introduced in the Senate—which provides for a division of the funds for this school so as to provide for two high schools instead of one—one on the ground on which the new Central High School is contemplated, and one in the eastern part of the District. I understand that recently the commissioners have been importuned to suspend operations, to take no action looking toward the beginning of construction or the letting of contracts, pending possible action by Congress on the proposition to modify the present plans for the Central High School.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. Sisson. I understood the gentleman to say that the commissioners had been importuned to stop the work on this high school?

Mr. MONDELL. They have been importuned or requested to suspend all action looking to the letting of the contracts and the beginning of construction.

Mr. Sisson. Does the gentleman know who made this request?

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is—and I get my information entirely from the newspapers—that a certain Senator, who has introduced a bill to modify the plan for the new Central High School, with a view of reducing the sizes of the proposed buildings, had requested the commissioners in writing to suspend action on the present project. I simply rise to express the hope that the commissioners will not take any action which will in any way delay the construction of this building in accordance with the plans heretofore adopted under the present limit of cost as provided by Congress. This new Central High School is very badly needed, and the plan proposed is one that will give the city a high school of which all the citizens of the District may well be proud. If we attempt to cut down or reduce the plan at this time, it will result, in my opinion, in a school or schools entirely inadequate for the growing needs of the city.

Mr. Sisson. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman, of course, does not concede that a Member of Congress or a Member of the Senate could suspend the operation of law.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, inasmuch as the commissioners have been asked to suspend the operation of law I do not know but what it would be a good idea for some one somewhere to express the hope and expectation they would not do anything of the sort, and it is for that purpose that I am now on my feet.

Mr. Sisson. But the gentleman is not assuming anybody has the right to stop the operation of law.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not assuming anything of that sort; no, sir. Now, Mr. Chairman, just one other matter. The commissioners estimate for an addition to the Powell School, situated on the heights in Mount Pleasant, and I regret that the committee did not see fit to approve that suggestion and include that item in the bill. I think it is necessary. Adjacent to the Powell School and now utilized for school purposes is a very old and somewhat dilapidated two-story frame building. That building is, in my opinion, dangerous. One of my children is now attending school in that frame building, and I do not think it is entirely safe. I do not believe that we ought to keep the children of the District in an old frame building heated with stoves; the danger is altogether too great. The District owns a half block of ground adjacent to the Powell School. The addition is needed, and it is needed particularly in order that children may not be required to use this old and, I fear, not over-safe frame building, and therefore I regret that this addition was not provided for.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SLAYDEN). The time of the gentleman has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Probation system: Probation officer, Supreme Court, \$2,000; stenographer and typewriter and assistant, \$800; police court—probation officer, \$1,500; assistant probation officer, \$1,200; contingent expenses, \$500; in all, \$6,000.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I see the gentleman in charge of the bill has returned to his seat, and I am going to ask the gentleman if he will now recur back to page 46, line 12, to the matter of the education of the blind? I have my amendment now prepared.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. We might just as well do so at this time as any other.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 12, after the word "necessary," insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the money appropriated by this act for public education shall be expended until provision shall be made for the education of blind children of teachable age in the District of Columbia."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, on that point of order I would like the gentleman to indicate what the point of order is.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has sought, in the form of his amendment, to make it a limitation upon this appropriation. The point of order I make is that there is a specific provision of law now existing that provides only for the education of indigent blind children in the District of Columbia and that the gentleman's amendment is in violation of and is contrary to existing law. That is the point of order I make against this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that there is a specific law providing for the education of indigent blind children, but I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there is no law against the education in the public schools of blind children of wealthy parents—in other words, of blind children who are not paupers—and the law also provides that the indigent children shall be educated, not in the public schools but in an institution over in Maryland or in some other State. Now, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, there is a general law providing for the public education of all children in the District of Columbia. And I will say further to the Chair that if the money were available this current year the board of school commissioners would to-day be educating blind children in the public schools of the District of Columbia. My amendment simply provides that none of the money appropriated for the next fiscal year for public education shall be expended until provision has been made for education of blind children—not indigent blind children, but blind children.

It seems to me that is clearly a limitation on the bill, because it is directing how the education shall be conducted and what classes of children shall receive education. It limits the power of the executive authorities to expend this money unless they expend whatever is necessary for the education of blind children—not indigent blind, but blind. It is really for all children in the District.

Now, under the organic law there is nothing to prevent the school authorities in this District from educating the deaf, dumb, and blind in the public schools at public expense if they see fit. The only thing that has prevented it heretofore has been the lack of interest or the lack of money, or both. But to-day those conditions have changed, and I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that under the law as it stands to-day the board of education have power, if they see fit, to educate not only the deaf and dumb but also the blind, with all other children of the District, in the public schools. This is a limitation which compels them to educate the blind if they spend any of the money at all for public education which we are appropriating.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, does the Chair desire to hear further? I do not care to be heard unless the Chair is in doubt.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask the chairman of the committee with reference to the existing law, or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], if he will answer the question.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, the existing law makes provision for certain classes of children, and if the Chair will look at the Revised Statutes of the United States, page 942, section 4869, he will find that the classes are segregated.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have the gentleman from Mississippi state the law.

Mr. Sisson. Here is the law with reference to blind children. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is seeking to do indirectly what he can not do directly, and seeking indirectly to repeal this section. This section provides:

Whenever the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied, by evidence produced by the president of the Columbia Institution for the Instruc-

tion of the Deaf and Dumb, that any blind person of teachable age can not command the means—

There is an institution provided in the organic act.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. This is for the blind.

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman is just a little hasty about it, because this affects the blind only. This section simply vests with the president of the institution the authority to do what he is instructed to do. The language proceeds—

to secure an education he may cause such person to be instructed in some institution for the education of the blind in Maryland or some other State at a cost not greater for each pupil than is or may be for the time being paid by such State, and to cause the same to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Now, there is a specific direction in reference to dealing with blind children; in reference to dealing with indigent blind children. The gentleman's amendment seeks to put the blind children in a different class and seeks to repeal with a proviso a substantive act in reference to blind children. The law does not now so provide. There is absolutely no provision for the employment of means or the appropriation of money for teaching blind children whose parents are able to teach them. The only provision of law is that in reference to the indigent blind, and this provision is the provision of law whereby in the District of Columbia the blind children are cared for. That is the only provision of law. The gentleman can not put a charge upon this bill unless he shows a specific act authorizing the expenditure, because it is not limiting the present expenditure of money. He is endeavoring to add additional expense. He is endeavoring to change existing law under the guise of a limitation and place a different law upon the statute books by his proviso.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, just a word or two in reply. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] states that my amendment increases the expense. If the gentleman will just read the amendment, he will see that it does not increase the expense at all. I do not ask for any specific appropriation, not even one penny. I say that none of the money appropriated for education shall be expended unless provision is made for educating the blind out of that appropriation; not an additional appropriation.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Just a moment. The gentleman cites the law that covers this case. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that that law applies only to one class of blind—the indigent blind. It has no bearing whatever upon the blind who have means or whose parents have means. My provision applies to the blind who have means or whose parents have means, and there is no law which prohibits the public education of any class of people unless they are feeble-minded or indigent. My provision reaches a class of people who are not feeble-minded and not indigent.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts indulge the Chair for a question?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman's amendment should be adopted, would the effect of it be to deny to the indigent blind children of the District of Columbia the advantage which this bill proposes to give them until an institution for the education of the blind of teachable age had been established in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, no. My amendment does not interfere at all with the continued education of indigent blind over in Maryland. That can go on if the parents of the indigent blind prefer to declare themselves paupers in order to get the advantage, if they deem it such, of an education in an institution in Maryland. That goes on just the same, provided Congress will appropriate the money from year to year to pay the expense of it. That is up to Congress to say whether they will appropriate money for the education of indigent blind outside of the District when the wealthy blind are being educated at public expense in the public schools of the District of Columbia. It is only a matter of inference what will happen to the indigent blind hereafter. You can reason that if the provision is made for the education of the blind in the public schools there will be no indigent blind to go outside of the District for an education; but it will not follow by any means, because, as is well known, there are indigent children not afflicted with blindness whose parents can not afford to send them to the public schools, and it might happen that if blind children were educated in the public schools there would be cases of parents not being able to support their blind children in the public schools and they would want the advantage of this act for the education of indigent blind at the institution over in Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It seems to the Chair very clear that while the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is in the form of a limitation, in effect it will be a change of the existing law; and while the Chair is not familiar with the statute read by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], the gentleman's reading of it went unchallenged, and the Chair assumes it to be entirely correct. The Chair is forced to the conclusion that the amendment is not in order. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Police court: Two judges, at \$3,600 each; clerk, \$2,200; deputy clerks—1, \$1,600, 1, \$1,500, 2 at \$1,200 each, 1, who shall be a stenographer and typewriter, \$900; deputy financial clerk, \$1,500; 7 bailiffs, at \$900 each; deputy marshal, \$1,000; janitor, \$600; engineer, \$900; assistant engineer, \$720; fireman, \$480; 2 assistant janitors, at \$300 each; matron, \$600; 3 charmen, at \$360 each; telephone operator, \$480; in all, \$30,060.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 11, after the word "court," strike out the words "2 judges, at \$3,600 each," and insert in lieu thereof the words "3 judges, at \$3,000 each."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Does the gentleman from North Carolina want four judges? I offer this amendment very largely because of the facts that appeared at the hearing on this subject. The commissioner testified:

I might say that the condition at that police court has got to receive the serious attention of the Congress very soon. The crowded condition of affairs is really startling, so much so that it reflects itself in all the various branches of the work there. You will find there an overburdened and an overworked court, with its attendants and clerical force. I have been down there very recently, and I do not see how the cases are disposed of in anything like an effective manner. They are so crowded there that it is impossible for the assistant corporation counsel to know the facts in but a small fractional part of the cases, and, indeed, they are tried without his presence in the court room there. From start to finish the situation is, in my humble opinion, quite lamentable.

Mr. Chairman, it ought not to be necessary for me to say to the majority members of this committee that I have been thoroughly in accord with their program of economy, and they have found me practically all along the line agreeing with them on that proposition; but I do believe that there are instances where so-called economy is not economy, and I believe this is one of them. The testimony clearly shows that the conditions in the police court of the District of Columbia are, as the commissioner says, indeed lamentable. If it is a fact, as he says, that there are so many cases that the corporation counsel is not even able to be present when they are being heard, surely the courts are unable to give them the attention that they deserve. In this amendment I suggest an additional judge, and reduce the salaries from \$3,600 to \$3,000, which would make an additional judge at an additional expense, so far as salary is concerned, of only \$1,400.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman, if the corporation counsel is charged with the prosecution of these cases, and is unable to appear in the cases tried by two judges, how would it be if there were three judges?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I will answer that by saying he probably would have an assistant who would help him, if necessary. I only point to that as an indication showing the crowded condition of the docket, and the large number of cases.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the corporation counsel the prosecuting officer in these police courts?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I think he is supposed to perform that duty.

Mr. MADDEN. I supposed that he furnished the necessary legal information to the officials of the District, but did not go into the police courts as a prosecutor.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. That may be true.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair supposes that the conversation between the two gentlemen from Illinois has no bearing on this amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. It has.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not spoken so that anyone at the desk could hear it.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. As I stated, Mr. Chairman, this amendment will add an additional judge and will relieve the situation at the courts. It will also do this: I am reliably informed that under the present conditions the dockets are so crowded that these petty offenders who are brought before the police magistrates require the attendance of police officers, and it frequently happens that half a dozen policemen are sitting around the court room nearly all day waiting until these trivial cases can be disposed of. If we had an additional judge, an additional court, so that these cases could be disposed of as they should be,

it would relieve a large number of policemen who are now sitting around two police courts waiting for cases to be disposed of.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, speaking to the merits of the amendment, and not to the point of order which I have reserved, I desire to say that there was no estimate made to the committee for an increase of the judges of this court. There was no representation made in the hearings which would indicate that there was any great congestion in the courts.

I also want to make an observation that the creation of another judge would not only call for an increase in the aggregate of salaries paid to the judges of the police court, but it would also call for an immediate appropriation for enlarged court facilities. There would have to be a court room provided for the new judge asked for in the amendment, which has not been estimated for, and no intimation has been given that it was urgent or necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. You would also have to provide him with a clerk, would you not?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; and other additional court officers, of course, in proportion to the number of judges who would hold the police court. Now, I have said so much in regard to the merits of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, but in order that we may save time, and wishing to be courteous to the gentleman from Illinois, who as a member of the subcommittee has given his time and attention and has been of very material service to the whole committee in the formation of this bill along the lines of economy, with the utmost courtesy to the gentleman, I must make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For material and labor for piping, conduit work, and extension of central heating plant, \$4,500.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, after line 23, page 63.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 23, page 63, insert the following:

"For the preparation of plans and specifications, necessary grading of site, and toward the erection of hospital buildings, including power house and domestic service building, to be located and erected on the site now owned by the District of Columbia at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets, with authority to contract for the completion of said buildings at a total cost not to exceed \$200,000, \$60,000."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, to that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment, which I admit is subject to a point of order, simply to call attention to the importance of the project which it contemplates. In the Book of Estimates this statement is made in regard to this hospital:

It is extremely important that work on the proposed hospital building should be commenced at once. The old frame buildings now used for hospital purposes at the Washington Asylum and Jail are utterly unfit for hospital uses and the patients now there can not be provided for until new buildings are erected.

That is an official declaration outlining and suggesting a situation that the committee having jurisdiction over the affairs of the District of Columbia should take cognizance of. I realize that it is not the province of the Committee on Appropriations to provide for this new construction, but there is a committee of this House whose duty it is to examine into these matters and inquire into the needs of the District.

It is a fact that at this time, if this bill passes with appropriations as recommended by the committee, there will remain in the District treasury after the District has paid its half of the appropriation the sum of \$1,500,000, approximately, all of which could be used for the purpose of providing these necessary additions to the facilities for the care and benefit of the people of this Capital City. We are officially informed by men charged with the responsibility in regard to the District of the necessity for the immediate construction of this hospital, and I venture to express the hope that the District Committee will at no distant date take up this matter, examine it carefully, and, if in their judgment a hospital is as necessary and urgent as the commissioners believe, that they may present to us legislation under which it may be provided for.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of prisoners: For conveying prisoners to Washington Asylum and Jail, including salary of driver, not to exceed \$720, and purchase and maintenance of necessary horses, wagons, and harness, \$2,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information. I desire to ask

some member of the committee what it costs or what is allowed the keepers of the jail here in the District for the boarding of prisoners per day? That is an issue out in my State at the present time, and I want to get some information upon it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The Government feeds them. The jailer does not get any specific appropriation for the amount of their board.

Mr. COX. In Indiana we have a statute which gives to the sheriffs of the various counties 40 cents a day for the boarding of each prisoner. He gets that 40 cents a day whether he actually feeds the prisoner 40 cents' worth of food or not. What I want to find out is whether a similar condition exists in the District of Columbia?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It does not, and I am sorry to hear that it still exists even in some of the counties of the gentleman's district.

Mr. COX. Not only in some of the counties, but all over the State of Indiana.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That system does not exist in the District of Columbia, and I agree with the gentleman that it is a bad system.

Mr. COX. What plan is in force here now providing for the boarding of these prisoners?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. There is an appropriation of \$35,000. The amount is based on the cost in the past of the supplies for the number of prisoners kept in the jail.

Mr. COX. Then do I understand this to be the rule—that the keeper of the jail is paid whatever he is required to expend for the boarding of the prisoners, whether it amounts to 40 cents a day or not?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, yes; that is true. He has this appropriation of \$35,000, and he provides out of that for the board of the prisoners in the jail under his charge.

Mr. COX. Then he is not allowed so much per day per prisoner?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No.

Mr. SISSON. My recollection is that the statement is made in the hearings that it costs about 30 cents and odd a day per prisoner.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for Tuberculosis Hospital, \$56,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 10, page 68, insert as a separate paragraph the following: "Hospital for inebriates: For a hospital for inebriates, \$75,000."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee, but I simply wish to call attention to the fact that this is one of the many items that were approved by the Commissioners of the District, one of several new projects which they approved which the Committee on Appropriations could not provide for, but which another committee has jurisdiction to make provision for. In the Book of Estimates we have this statement:

At present the District of Columbia has no facilities for treating inebriates properly. An inebriate is treated as a criminal and inebriation is treated as a crime. The modern theory is that inebriation is a disease for which the victim should be treated in a hospital and not in a jail. It is to meet this theory and the existing demand for such an institution that the recommendation for this appropriation is made. It is recommended that the hospital be located on property already owned by the District, where the Tuberculosis Hospital is located, and where it is proposed to build a municipal hospital.

A municipal hospital was recommended by the Commissioners of the District and this hospital for inebriates is recommended by the Commissioners of the District. Many other recommendations are made by the commissioners which the Committee on Appropriations can not approve or provide for simply because that committee has no jurisdiction over new projects. I again express the hope that the committee that has jurisdiction over these matters may find time, in connection with its other activities relative to the District, its criticism of the District, its attempts to load burdens upon the District, to take some constructive action looking to providing for these needs of the District and its people. The District has the money with which to build these needed hospitals. One million and a half dollars will remain of their revenues after they have paid half of all of the appropriations provided in this bill, and yet these needed facilities can not be provided because the committee charged under the law with caring for and having jurisdiction over these matters has not had the time or the

disposition, whichever it may be, to investigate these matters and pass upon them favorably.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for Industrial Home School for Colored Children, \$18,490: *Provided*, That all moneys received at said school as income from sale of products and from payment of board, of instruction, or otherwise, shall be paid over to the commissioners to be expended by them in the support of the school during the fiscal year 1915.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso in that paragraph, and, pending that, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] if that does not leave practically unlimited the appropriation which may go for this industrial home? In other words, \$18,490 is appropriated for it and a great deal of that money will be used for the purchase of lumber and various other stuffs which when manufactured might be worth a great deal of money, and if it is sold and then put to the use of the institution it would increase the appropriation to what extent I do not know, and I would be glad to have the information as to what extent it might increase it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman in that connection that this proviso is out of line with the policy pursued generally by this committee in the framing of this bill, but there was very great opportunity upon the subcommittee that this proviso be put in. The income from the products of the colored school for 1912 was \$3,394.26; in 1913 it was \$290.08. The products are nearly all consumed on the place and only the surplus is sold. That is the record as shown in the past of that which was sold and the receipts from it that could be under this proviso.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Am I correct in the conclusion this is law only for the current year?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; that is right; this is law only for the current year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I withdraw the point of order. The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HULL). The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TEMPORARY HOMES.

Municipal lodging house and wood and stone yard: Superintendent, who shall also act as foreman, \$1,200; cook, \$360; night watchman for six months, at \$25 per month, \$150; maintenance, \$1,820; in all, \$3,530.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to follow the paragraph just read as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 71, after line 15, by inserting a new paragraph, as follows:

"Municipal lodging house: For a new municipal lodging house, to be erected on the site of the present municipal lodging-house, \$50,000."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is subject to a point of order, and I thank the gentleman for reserving rather than making the point of order. I will not take up the time of the committee, but will simply say I have offered this as another illustration of a new and needed project in the District, one that has been repeatedly recommended and one which the committee having jurisdiction of these matters should consider. The Committee on Appropriations can not make provision for this new municipal lodging house. The Commissioners of the District insist that it is badly needed. The present municipal lodging house is an old building, has to be constantly repaired, is too small, is very greatly crowded; a new building is needed. I desire again to call attention to the fact that the people of the District of Columbia have abundant funds, after paying half of all the appropriations proposed by this bill, to provide for this and for other needed projects to which I have referred. All the large municipalities of the country have municipal lodging houses. It is a disgrace to the Capital City of the Nation that the only municipal lodging house we have is an old, inadequate structure, entirely too small for the needs of the District. A new lodging house is needed, and it should be provided for by the committee having jurisdiction over such matters.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of troops, other than Government employees, to be disbursed under the authority and direction of the commanding general, \$24,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on so much as is contained in lines 5, 6, and 7 on page 76, providing for the payment of troops. There is no authorization for it, and I therefore make the point of order against it. I will say to the Chair that the law can be found in volume 25, page 780.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, without having looked up the law as to the authorization of this item, I recall distinctly that this point of order was made in the current appropriation bill a year ago and that the point of order was overruled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Oh, no.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Was the point of order sustained?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman the point of order was made and sustained, and it went over to the Senate, and the Senate readjusted it, and in that way it found its way into the current law.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I have not before me any information and I would ask that the matter be passed over for the moment and we will revert to it. I ask unanimous consent that the item may be passed for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the item will be passed over for the present.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

REFUND OF ERRONEOUS COLLECTIONS.

To enable the commissioners, in any case where special assessments, school tuition charges, rents, or fees of any character have been erroneously covered into the Treasury to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in equal parts, to refund such erroneous payments, wholly or in part, including the refunding of fees paid for building permits authorized by the District appropriation act approved March 2, 1911, \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for such refunds of payments made within three years.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a committee amendment. In line 19, after the word "within," insert the words "the past," so as to make it read, "within the past three years."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 76, line 19, by adding, after the word "within," the words "the past."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the services of assistant engineers, draftsmen, levelers, rodmen, chainmen, and inspectors temporarily required in connection with water-department work authorized by appropriations may be employed exclusively to carry into effect said appropriations, and be paid therefrom, when specifically and in writing ordered by the commissioners, and the commissioners in their annual estimates shall report the number of such employees performing such services and their work and the sums paid to each: *Provided*, That the expenditures hereunder shall not exceed \$13,200 during the fiscal year 1915.

The commissioners are further authorized to employ temporarily such laborers, skilled laborers, and mechanics as may be required in connection with water-department work, and to incur all necessary engineering and other expenses, exclusive of personal services, incidental to carrying on such work and necessary for the proper execution thereof, said laborers, skilled laborers, and mechanics to be employed to perform such work as may not be required by existing law to be done under contract, and to pay for such services and expenses from the appropriation under which such services are rendered and expenses incurred.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if he can tell the House how much revenue is derived from the water department of the District?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think I can. The report contains the statement that the estimated revenues for 1915 will amount to \$749,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Do they not give the actual revenue?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; they do not.

Mr. MADDEN. They ought to give the revenue for the last fiscal year, ought they not?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think we have those figures and will give them to the gentleman. That information is included in the report of the commissioners to Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the committee able to state whether all the revenues from the water department are used by the commissioners in the extension and maintenance of the water system?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Practically all the water revenues are used in the extension and maintenance of the water system in the city, and while there is possibly a small balance left over each year, the great bulk of those revenues are expended for the purpose of the improvement of the water system.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the committee know anything about what the charges are for the use of water to the consuming public—what the rates are?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes. That is stated in the hearings. The rates are lower than in possibly any other city in the United States. To the ordinary householder the charge is \$4 or \$4.50 a year, without regard to the amount consumed; and then there is a price to manufacturers, which is an exceedingly low price—lower than in any other city that your committee compared the city of Washington with.

Mr. MADDEN. The thought I had in mind was that perhaps the committee might find a way by which they could reduce the water-rate charges to the consuming public by the utilization of surplus funds.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In the preparation of this bill I think the committee and previous committees in looking over the revenues from the water department have felt that the system was not yet so thoroughly perfected as to warrant a recommendation for a reduction of rates. The committee thought it was wiser to expend the water revenues in the expansion of the system rather in the reduction of the rates, because the water rates here are already cheaper than those of any other city with which we could compare them.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will permit me, I may say that Col. Harding, in answering a question propounded by me, said that for an expenditure of \$4.50 each family gets 56,100 gallons, whereupon the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] remarked that that was an amount that would hardly ever be consumed by an ordinary family, and Col. Harding answered "Yes." The matter was thoroughly gone into by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That the commissioners are authorized to employ in the execution of work the cost of which is payable from the appropriation account created in the District appropriation act for the fiscal year 1905, approved April 27, 1904, and known as the "Miscellaneous trust-fund deposits, District of Columbia," all necessary inspectors, overseers, foremen, sewer tappers, skilled laborers, mechanics, laborers, special policemen stationed at street railway crossings, one inspector of gas fitting, two janitors for laboratories of the Washington and Georgetown Gas Light Cos., market master, assistant market master, watchman, horses, carts, and wagons, and to incur all necessary expenses incidental to carrying on such work and necessary for the proper execution thereof, such services and expenses to be paid from said appropriation account.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] reserves a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Against which paragraph does the gentleman reserve a point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Section 5, page 83. This appears to be of an omnibus character, and I assume that it is new legislation. I think it would not be amiss to have the chairman make some explanation of the purpose of this omnibus clause.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I would say to the gentleman that while it is unquestionably legislation, it is not new legislation. This identical language has been carried in the bill for several years prior to this time, and was not inserted at this time by this committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I attempted to locate it in last year's appropriation act, but I could not find it, and I assumed that it was new legislation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; the gentleman's assumption is not correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee what is the purpose of this provision, which requires it to be carried each year in the appropriation bill? If it is necessary, and it is carried in the bill each year, why would it not be better to have it incorporated into permanent law, rather than carry it each year in this temporary form?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Conceding that it belongs here, and that it ought to become permanent law, I beg to remind the gentleman that the committee bringing in this bill has not the authority conferred upon it by the rules of the House to make permanent law in regard to matters in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. In some urgent cases the committee has seen fit to make exceptions, and this might be a case of that kind. Will the gentleman kindly explain why it should be permanent law and the purpose of it? I read the provision rather carefully and was not able to obtain, from reading it, any good idea of the scope of it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. This is a trust fund, as I understand it, that is deposited by householders and others against whom a charge is assessed when there is a cut of these gas mains and other things. In addition to that, when gas is turned on in a house the householder is required to make a

deposit with the gas company. That is refunded under certain conditions after his occupancy of the house ceases, after the turning off of the gas.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that the purpose of this provision is to reimburse the United States for expenditures that it may have made for the benefit of some private individual or corporation. I notice here a provision as to special policemen stationed at street railway crossings.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; that is one of the purposes and one of the things that the paragraph does.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is merely a matter of accounting, then?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It is a matter of accounting, largely.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would it meet with the favor of the committee, if the chairman believes it ought to be permanent law, to have some one offer an amendment making it permanent law, providing that hereafter the commissioners are authorized, and so forth?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; it would not be—

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish to do anything against the desire of the committee.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That would not be acceptable to the committee, for the reason that without more consideration as to the necessity for its permanency the committee do not think it well to make it permanent. It is simply the desire of the committee to carry it as it has been carried, at least for the present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, having received sufficient enlightenment from the distinguished chairman of the committee as to the purpose of this section, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That all laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with this act are repealed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Why does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Because it is legislation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reverting to the question that we passed over, in regard to the militia, I concede the point of order raised by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order as to the paragraph on page 76, beginning with line 5.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 48, noes 5.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 36, answered "present" 7, not voting 154, as follows:

YEAS—236.

Abercrombie	Barton	Brodbeck	Burke, Wis.
Ainey	Beakes	Brown, N. Y.	Byrnes, S. C.
Allen	Bell, Cal.	Brown, W. Va.	Byrnes, Tenn.
Anderson	Blackmon	Brown, Wis.	Calder
Ashbrook	Booher	Bruckner	Callaway
Aswell	Borchers	Brumbaugh	Candler, Miss.
Baker	Borland	Bryan	Cantrill
Bartholdt	Bowdle	Buchanan, Ill.	Caraway
Bartlett	Britten	Buchanan, Tex.	Carew

Carlin	Gray	Levy	Sherwood
Carter	Green, Iowa	Lewis, Md.	Sims
Casey	Gregg	Lindbergh	Sinnott
Chandler, N. Y.	Griest	Lloyd	Sisson
Church	Griffin	Loft	Slayden
Claypool	Gudger	Loneragan	Slomp
Clayton	Hamilton, Mich.	McAndrews	Sloan
Connelly, Kans.	Hammond	McClellan	Smith, J. M. C.
Conry	Hardy	McDermott	Smith, Md.
Covington	Hawley	McGillicuddy	Smith, Minn.
Cox	Hay	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Saml. W.
Cramton	Hayden	McKellar	Smith, Tex.
Curry	Helgesen	McKenzie	Stafford
Davis	Helm	McLaughlin	Steensson
Decker	Helvering	Madden	Stephens, Cal.
Deitrick	Henry	Mahan	Stephens, Miss.
Dent	Hensley	Mapes	Stephens, Tex.
Dickinson	Hill	Miller	Stevens, N. H.
Dies	Hinebaugh	Mitchell	Stone
Donovan	Holland	Montague	Stout
Doolling	Howard	Moon	Sutherland
Doolittle	Howell	Morgan, La.	Talcott, N. Y.
Doughton	Hughes, Ga.	Morgan, Okla.	Tavener
Dupré	Hullings	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Dyer	Hull	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, N. Y.
Eagle	Humphrey, Wash.	Oglesby	Temple
Edmonds	Igoe	Oldfield	Ten Eyck
Edwards	Johnson, S. C.	O'Leary	Thacher
Fergusson	Johnson, Utah	Padgett	Thomson, Ill.
Ferris	Keister	Page, N. C.	Townsend
Fess	Kelley, Mich.	Patton, Pa.	Treadway
Fitzgerald	Kelly, Pa.	Peterson	Underhill
FitzHenry	Kennedy, Conn.	Phelan	Vare
Flood, Va.	Kent	Platt	Vaughan
Floyd, Ark.	Key, Ohio	Porter	Volstead
Fowler	Kiess, Pa.	Pou	Walsh
Francis	Kindel	Powers	Watkins
Gardner	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Quin	Watson
Garner	Kinhead, N. J.	Ralney	Weaver
Garrett, Tex.	Kitchin	Raker	Webb
George	Konop	Rauch	Whaley
Gilmore	Korbly	Reed	Whitacre
Glass	La Follette	Relly, Conn.	White
Godwin, N. C.	Langley	Rogers	Williams
Goldfogle	Lazaro	Rubey	Willis
Good	Lee, Ga.	Rupley	Wilson, Fla.
Gorman	Lee, Pa.	Russell	Woodruff
Goulden	Lenroot	Seldomridge	Woods
Graham, Ill.	Leshner	Shackleford	Young, N. Dak.
Graham, Pa.	Lever	Sherley	Young, Tex.

NAYS—36.

Austin	Davenport	MacDonald	Switzer
Avis	Farr	Mondell	Taggart
Bailey	French	Murdock	Taylor, Ala.
Barkley	Gillett	Neeley, Kans.	Thompson, Okla.
Bathrick	Hayes	Park	Towner
Butler	Johnson, Ky.	Payne	Tribble
Campbell	Kahn	Roberts, Mass.	Walters
Cooper	Knowland, J. R.	Rouse	Wingo
Crosser	McCoy	Scott	Witherspoon

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Browning	Hinds	Smith, Idaho	Underwood
Frear	Jacoway	Talbot, Md.	

NOT VOTING—154.

Adair	Doremus	Johnson, Wash.	Parker
Adamson	Driscoll	Jones	Patten, N. Y.
Aiken	Dunn	Keating	Peters, Mass.
Alexander	Eagan	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters, Me.
Ansberry	Elder	Kennedy, R. I.	Plumley
Anthony	Esch	Kettner	Post
Baltz	Estopinal	Kirkpatrick	Prouty
Barchfeld	Evans	Kreider	Ragsdale
Barnhart	Fairchild	Lafferty	Rayburn
Beall, Tex.	Falcon	Langham	Reilly, Wis.
Bell, Ga.	Falconer	L'Engle	Richardson
Bremner	Fields	Lewis, Pa.	Riordan
Brockson	Finley	Lieb	Roberts, Nev.
Broussard	Fordney	Lindquist	Rothermel
Bulkley	Foster	Linthicum	Rucker
Burgess	Gallagher	Lobeck	Sabath
Burke, Pa.	Gard	Logue	Saunders
Burke, S. Dak.	Garrett, Tenn.	Maguire, Nebr.	Scully
Burnett	Gerry	Maher	Sells
Cantor	Gittins	Manahan	Sharp
Cary	Goeke	Mann	Shreve
Clancy	Goodwin, Ark.	Martin	Small
Clark, Fla.	Gordon	Merritt	Smith, N. Y.
Cline	Greene, Mass.	Metz	Sparkman
Coady	Greene, Vt.	Moore	Stanley
Collier	Guernsey	Morin	Stedman
Connolly, Iowa	Hamill	Moss, W. Va.	Stephens, Nebr.
Copley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Stevens, Minn.
Crisp	Hamlin	Murray, Mass.	Stringer
Cullop	Hardwick	Murray, Okla.	Summers
Curley	Harrison	Neely, W. Va.	Taylor, Ark.
Dale	Hart	Nelson	Thomas
Danforth	Haugen	Nolan, J. I.	Tuttle
Dershem	Hefflin	Norton	Walker
Difenderfer	Hobson	O'Brien	Wallin
Dillon	Houston	O'Hair	Wilson, N. Y.
Dixon	Hoxworth	O'Shaunessy	Winslow
Donohoe	Hughes, W. Va.	Palce, Mass.	
	Humphreys, Miss.	Palmer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
For the session:

Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.
Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.
Until further notice:
Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.
Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. MERRITT.
Mr. CRISP with Mr. HINDS (transferable).
Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. FORDNEY.
Mr. CLANCY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.
Mr. ADAIR with Mr. BARCHFELD.
Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.
Mr. BARNHART with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. CARY.
Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. BURGESS with Mr. DANFORTH.
Mr. BURNETT with Mr. DILLON.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. DUNN.
Mr. COLLIER with Mr. FALCONER.
Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.
Mr. DIFENDERFER with Mr. GUERNSEY.
Mr. DONOHUE with Mr. HAUGEN.
Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. LANGHAM.
Mr. FAISON with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. FINLEY with Mr. LINDQUIST.
Mr. FOSTER with Mr. MANAHAN.
Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. MOORE.
Mr. GOEKE with Mr. MORIN.
Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.
Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. MOTT.
Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. NELSON.
Mr. HARRISON with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.
Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. PARKER.
Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. PETERS of Maine.
Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. PLUMLEY.
Mr. LIEB with Mr. PROUTY.
Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.
Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. NORTON.
Mr. POST with Mr. J. I. NOLAN.
Mr. PALMER with Mr. WINGLOW.
Mr. RUCKER with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
Mr. SABATH with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.
Mr. SHARP with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
Mr. SMALL with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.
Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. KREIDER.
Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. SELLS.
Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. SHREVE.
Mr. WALKER with Mr. LAFFERTY.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye," but I am paired with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SCULLY, and I withdraw that vote and answer "present."

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present," because I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CRISP.

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago, on the second call of the roll, I thought I heard my name and answered. It turns out that I voted for some one of the Browns. I later voted when my name was called.

The SPEAKER. Which one of the Browns did the gentleman vote for?

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. I do not know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye," but I have a standing pair with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN, who is absent on account of sickness. I therefore desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The SPEAKER. On this vote the yeas are 236, the nays are 36, present 7. A quorum is present, the bill is passed, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors.

On motion of Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

OPIUM BILLS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up two bills on the Speaker's table with Senate amendments. They are known as the opium bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1967) regulating the manufacture of smoking opium in the United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, let us have the bill reported.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it requires unanimous consent. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the House that the first amendment increases the penalty from \$200 to \$300, and the second amendment of the Senate broadens the definition of smoking opium so that it covers a larger field. I think that is all.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, what is the provision with regard to imprisonment? Is it in the alternative?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not remember the original bill sufficiently well to recall that fact at this time.

Mr. COOPER. A mere increase in the fine of \$100 per pound will not amount to anything as a preventive.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman that all we are dealing with are the Senate amendments. The Senate increases the amount from \$200 to \$300 a pound.

Mr. COOPER. That will do nothing, in my judgment.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is a House bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is a House bill with Senate amendments, and the only question is whether we will agree to the Senate amendments.

Mr. COOPER. Is there not some one here who can tell what the House bill did provide?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have the bill before me. I will state that the gentleman from New York, Mr. Harrison, had these bills in charge before he became governor of the Philippine Islands. The paragraph reads as follows:

That an internal-revenue tax of \$200 per pound shall be levied and collected upon all opium manufactured in the United States for smoking purposes—

And so forth.

I was mistaken when I said that this was a penalty. As a matter of fact, it is a tax. In other words, this bill as written taxes the sale of opium very highly.

Mr. PAYNE. The tax makes a very severe penalty, makes it prohibitive.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; that is it.

Mr. COOPER. But it legalizes it and recognizes it as a legitimate industry and puts that price of \$200 a pound upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin grasps the purpose of the bill. This is a bill to levy a tax. It is one of a series of bills that have been agreed to by an international conference of many of the leading nations of the world. This bill is being enacted to carry out that agreement. This proposition is to levy a tax. There is a tax on opium to-day, a very small one, comparatively. This bill is written to make a very high tax, to prevent the manufacture or sale of opium. In other words, it is putting the tax so high that it is practically prohibitive.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Alabama will permit, I will state that the Committee on Ways and Means considered the proposition and came to the conclusion that they could not prohibit the manufacture of smoking opium; that they had no power to do that. Hence they came as near prohibiting it as they possibly could, by putting on a prohibitory tax. The Senate has increased the amount of that tax.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the reason I have asked these questions is because within the last few days I have received a communication from members of a society interested in the suppression of the traffic in habit-forming drugs, in which communication the statement is specifically made, without qualification, that to-day we have no effective statutes upon that subject, but that there are constantly being imported, in total disregard of the spirit of the law but not, possibly, of the letter, quantities of drugs of that kind, and that these are being used everywhere and sold everywhere, to the great injury of the health of people.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the purpose in passing this bill is to carry out that very idea and to protect the people against the use of these habit-forming drugs.

Mr. COOPER. An increase of \$100 a pound will not stop anyone who manufactures opium for smoking.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the increase over the House bill.

Mr. COOPER. I voted against this bill, if it is the Harrison bill, because I thought at that time it was full of loopholes and pointed out two or three. That bill ought not to have passed the House of Representatives—the bill which Mr. Harrison of New York fathered in this House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I misunderstood the gentleman's position. I thought he was in favor of this class of legislation.

Mr. COOPER. I am in favor of legislation which is prohibitive, but I am not in favor of an act which pretends to pro-

hibit but which does not. I recall the provisions of the bill very well, if it is the original Harrison bill, which went through this House months ago—way back, I should say, in May.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman overlooks the fact we have not got the power to write a bill that would prohibit the importation of opium, but we have the governmental power that will allow us to levy a tax that has the same effect to prohibit the importation of opium, and it is through the tax we expect to prohibit it from coming in.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman say that we have not the right to prohibit the importation of opium for smoking purposes in the United States?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think we have the right—

Mr. PAYNE. It is the manufacture, not the importation; the manufacture.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is the manufacture of opium, not the importation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I might anticipate the gentleman, but I have in my hand a copy of the bill that he intends to bring up next, which seeks to prohibit the importation of opium except when it is to be used for medicinal purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe my colleague has that bill in mind and he will find that bill has an imprisonment penalty in the alternative in addition to a money fine. That is the bill undoubtedly the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly; they are companion bills. This bill is a bill to prohibit the manufacture—that is, to tax the manufacture out of existence—and the other bill, which I will call up in a moment when this is disposed of, is a bill in reference to the importation. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendments were agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF IMPORTATION OF OPIUM.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 1966, "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes,' approved February 9, 1909," with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendments were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the bills were passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman in charge will be able to report the Post Office appropriation bill in about 20 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess for 20 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is present—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is why I asked to take a recess.

Mr. STAFFORD. But at the last meeting of our committee there was an understanding that the Post Office appropriation bill was not to be considered within five days after the convening of Congress following the recess. Several members of the Committee on the Post Office made that special request in anticipation of their absence, so I certainly would not like to have any agreement that would be in conflict with the understanding that was made.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and I do not understand it that way. I understood this to be the fact: That the committee instructed the chairman to report the bill on the first day of the session unless he had matters coming from the Postmaster General that would have to be incorporated in the bill, in which case he would wait five days before he reported the bill and call the committee together to consider the items. That was my understanding. That was the flat instruction—to report the bill; and it was left optional with him whether to report or to call a meeting of the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that in this matter I am asking the House to await the convenience of the chairman of his committee, and—

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to that request.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When he comes in he will take the matter up with the gentleman. I am not informed about it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to have general debate on it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. The purpose is to report the bill to-night, so that it may be printed and taken up to-morrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, Mr. Speaker, I see other members of the committee here, and in view of my distinct recollection of what transpired in the committee I would like to see whether I am in error or whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is in error.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] will be on the floor in a minute, and then he can discuss the question with one who knows. Not being a member of the committee myself, I am not informed as to what transpired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I was present when the agreement was made, and I quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. I am quite sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin is sincere in his statements, but I understand the case is exactly as reported by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CLAYTON rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

REMOVAL OF CAUSES TO FEDERAL COURTS.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 3484, to amend paragraph 8, section 24, chapter 2, of the Judicial Code, and consider the same as a substitute for House bill 9994, which is on the House Calendar, from the Committee on the Judiciary of the House with a favorable report.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that this Senate bill and the House bill are substantially the same. Section 24 of the Judicial Code provides that a cause may be transferred from a State court to a Federal court provided the amount involved is \$3,000. In this same section there is this proviso:

That the foregoing provision as to the sum or value of the matter in controversy shall not be construed to apply to any of the cases mentioned in the succeeding paragraph of this section.

Paragraph 8 of the section, which is one of the succeeding paragraphs, provides that the Federal courts shall have jurisdiction—

Of all suits and proceedings arising under any law regulating commerce except those suits and proceedings exclusive jurisdiction of which has been conferred upon the Commerce Court.

Now, some of the Federal courts have construed that proviso and that exception to mean that if it is an action for damages, say, against a railroad company, on account of the loss or injury, say, to live stock—and those are the most frequent cases happening that call for this legislation—this proviso and this subsection 8, which I have read, take it out of the general operation of the law, and they contend that the cause can be transferred to a Federal court. They say such a cause involving damages can be transferred to a Federal court irrespective of the amount involved; and under that ruling the Federal courts have taken very small cases, some, I believe, from courts of justices of the peace, and some for \$100, and, I believe, some for less than that from other sources. This bill seeks to remedy that, and seeks to carry out the intention which Congress had in limiting the amount for which a cause can be transferred to at least \$3,000, and it cures the defects in the existing statute.

The bill is unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, and I am advised it is unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and it has passed the Senate unanimously. I have asked that the Senate bill be taken up and considered now and passed in lieu of the House bill, which is on the calendar with a favorable report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the bill reported by the House Judiciary Committee is on the calendar?

Mr. CLAYTON. It is.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it on the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. CLAYTON. I have not the calendar before me.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the exceptional reason why this bill should be given place over many others that are on the Unanimous Consent Calendar or that have been reported by committees of the House?

Mr. CLAYTON. Nothing except the urgent nature of the case, and the Senate bill is on the Speaker's table. I think it is a matter of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] calls up this bill under clause 2 of Rule XXIV:

But House bills with Senate amendments which do not require consideration in a Committee of the Whole may be at once disposed of as the House may determine, as may also Senate bills substantially the same as House bills already favorably reported by a committee of the House, and not required to be considered in Committee of the Whole,

be disposed of in the same manner on motion directed to be made by such committee.

So that the question whether this bill is on the Unanimous Consent Calendar or not has nothing to do with it.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand this is identical with a House bill which has been favorably reported.

The SPEAKER. It is so nearly identical with it as to come within the rule.

Mr. PAYNE. It does not need unanimous consent, then.

The SPEAKER. No; it does not need unanimous consent. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, moves that Senate bill 3484 be taken up and disposed of, a House bill identical with it having been reported from the House Judiciary Committee, and being now on the calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to add to what the gentleman from Alabama has said, that there is a great need for the passage of this bill. Every day the railroads are taking little trifling cases, that amount to from \$25 to \$100, and transferring them from the State courts to the Federal courts.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to suggest that this debate is all out of order until the bill is reported.

The SPEAKER. Of course no bill can be passed without being read. That would be the worst sort of practice to set up. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, being chapter 231 of Thirty-sixth Statutes at Large, be amended by inserting at the conclusion of section 28, chapter 3, of said act, the following:

"And provided further, That no suit brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction against a railroad company or other corporation or person engaged in and carrying on the business of a common carrier to recover damages for delay, loss of, or injury to property received for transportation by such common carrier, under section 20 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended June 29, 1906, April 13, 1908, February 25, 1909, and June 18, 1910, shall be removed to any court of the United States where the matter in controversy does not exceed, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum or value of \$3,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reserve a point of order. Do I understand that a similar House bill has been reported from the committee?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; I made that statement.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not find it on the calendar, and sometimes we are all in error—even as distinguished a gentleman as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CLAYTON. Very often in error—very much more often than the gentleman from Wisconsin. However, House bill 9994 has been reported and is on the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not find any such bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on the House Calendar.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will look on page 10 of Calendar No. 32, he will find it there.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw my statement and apologize to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope there may be no further objection to this bill.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to call up this bill will be considered as carried. Now, the question is—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is debate in order now?

The SPEAKER. Debate is in order, the same as on any other bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama has the floor if he cares to use it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I beg your pardon. The gentleman yielded to me a moment ago, and I thought that continued.

Mr. CLAYTON. Does the gentleman desire some time?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I should like about three to five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, this is my bill, and I should like 15 minutes.

Mr. CLAYTON. I hope the gentleman will not take 15 minutes to discuss this meritorious bill. I know he is in favor of it, and I know he is the author of the House bill on the subject, but I think that the printing of the report, made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER], with which the gentleman from Iowa is perfectly familiar, will enable us to get along with less time. But I yield to the gentleman 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, Senator KENYON, of Iowa, introduced a bill in the Senate during the last session having for

its object the legislation now under consideration. His bill was redrafted by the Senate Judiciary Committee, reported favorably, and passed just before the holiday recess. I introduced a bill in the House October last to effect the same result. The bill with slight changes was reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House favorably, and is now on the calendar for action by the House. The bill which passed the Senate is the same in substance as the House bill, and for that reason the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CLAYTON, moves to substitute the Senate bill, consider, and pass it.

It is well understood that causes may be transferred from State to United States courts in cases of diverse citizenship when any considerable amount is involved. Originally the amount was fixed at \$500, then it was increased to \$2,000, and finally to \$3,000, where it now exists, except in the cases we are now to consider.

This limitation of amount as a condition of transfer was and is very valuable to the people in cases against railroad companies where the corporation has its "citizenship" in one State while its lines extend through several States. In all the States other than the one which granted the charter were it not for the limitation referred to small cases, involving even less than \$100, could be transferred by the railroad company from the State court in the locality in which the complainant resides and through which the line runs to a United States court located perhaps a hundred or more miles away. But the law prevented these transfers unless the amount involved was more than \$3,000.

Such was the condition until January, 1912, when the new Judicial Code went into operation, wherein the laws affecting the removal of causes were revised and codified. In the act a clause was inserted which provided that the limitation of amount should not apply in cases "of all suits and proceedings arising under any law regulating commerce."

In *Adams Express Co. v. Croninger* (266 U. S., 491) it was held that under the provisions of the interstate-commerce act and its amendments all cases against railroad companies for loss or damage were "suits and proceedings" under the law regulating commerce.

Last summer Judge Amidon held that in all cases against railroad companies for loss or damage to property which is being transported in interstate commerce the companies had the right to transfer the cases from State to United States courts, no matter what the amount in controversy. (*McGoon v. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.*, 204 Fed. Rept., 998.)

Since this decision was published hundreds of cases have been transferred where the amount in controversy was less than \$3,000. Cases where less than \$100 was involved, cases brought before justices of the peace, have been removed to the United States courts, and the plaintiffs, if they desired to press their cases to judgment, were compelled to go to a distant city, at large expense, and try them in a United States court.

A farmer could not recover for the loss of a cow without facing the necessity of a long, expensive litigation at a distant point in a strange court. It results in all such cases in an absolute denial of justice.

I think I am justified in saying that there was no intention or expectation of thus changing the law. No one thought at the time of its enactment that such an interpretation would be placed upon it. But nevertheless the condition exists and ought to be remedied.

All that is attempted to accomplish by these bills is to place the law in the condition it was intended and supposed to be—to prevent the right of transfer unless the amount in controversy exceeds \$3,000 in all such cases.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was the right of transfer given in the law of 1887?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; and existed always.

Mr. MURDOCK. But specifically in the law of 1887?

Mr. TOWNER. I think so.

Mr. MURDOCK. What further changes were made in the law subsequently?

Mr. TOWNER. Nothing; except that since that time the amount in controversy for which jurisdiction could be retained in the State court has been increased from \$2,000 to \$3,000, at which amount it existed until this year, when they first began to interpret the judicial code as taking away the limitation of amount and allowing transfers in all cases, no matter what amount was involved.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. As I understand the situation, this is an amendment to prohibit the transfer of such cases as the

gentleman mentioned; for example, the running over and killing of a cow by a railroad company, to prevent the transfer of such suits for damages for the wrongful act to the Federal courts?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I favor the bill and think it good, but I notice in the proviso that you use this language, and I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks it covers the case that he has referred to:

Provided, however, That in suits now pending or hereafter brought in State courts based upon any contract or agreement for transportation or for failure to perform a duty imposed by law to person or property, or for delay, injury, damage, or loss to any property in the carriage, transporting, receiving, and delivery thereof, against any common carrier or carriers, railroad, or transportation company, and when the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, is less than \$3,000, the jurisdiction shall be and remain in said State courts until final determination, and shall not be transferred on motion or otherwise to any court of the United States.

Does the gentleman think that that language covers the case of wrongful killing of stock by a railroad when it is not being transported?

Mr. TOWNER. I think so; but that is not applicable here, because we are considering the bill passed by the Senate and not the House bill.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Is not this the Senate bill?

Mr. TOWNER. We are considering the Senate bill as a substitute; but the gentleman is reading from the bill H. R. 9994, is he not?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is an amendment to what is called the Carmack amendment?

Mr. TOWNER. It refers to the same subject matter.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It was the Carmack amendment that the Supreme Court held brought it within the removal statute, but the Carmack amendment only applied to transportation cases.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I was reading from the House bill, which the gentleman from Alabama said was substantially the same as the Senate bill, and what I wanted to inquire is whether it covers the case of wrongful killing of stock by being run over and injured or killed by a railway train when the stock is not being transported.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the House bill would have covered such cases as the gentleman refers to; but that need not now be discussed, for we are considering the Senate substitute.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield; yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the question the gentleman asked was whether this would cover damages for the killing of stock by running over them at road crossings, and that sort of thing.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Stock on the track.

Mr. BORLAND. With the permission of the gentleman from Iowa, I would state that I do not think it could cover such a case. The law says "property received for transportation," and unquestionably there might be a great many stock-killing cases that are now in the State courts and that never have been affected by this decision at all, and that never did go to the Federal courts. This says "property received for transportation."

Mr. TOWNER. It is the limit also of the act sought to be amended.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Missouri that the example given here was the case of the killing of stock by running over it on the tracks, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. PETERSON. Is not the gentleman from Iowa unhappy in his illustration? Of course, running over a cow on a railroad track would not constitute a case that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. He is, therefore, a little unhappy in his illustration.

Mr. TOWNER. Perhaps, as to the cow on the track. But still the cow might have been killed under circumstances which would have been unquestionably transportation in interstate commerce, and the difficulty is that in all such cases, when such small amounts are involved, the railroad companies can defeat recovery by transferring the cases to the United States courts, and that is what we are trying to prevent.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would not have asked for recognition originally if I had observed that my colleague, Judge TOWNER, was on the floor. From the fact that he was on the other side of the House I missed him, and for that reason I asked for recognition; but now, at this time, I wish to speak a little further concerning the matter inquired of by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ELDER].

The case to which he refers is not removable unless the amount involved exceeds \$3,000. It does not come within the provisions of the Carmack amendment, which was so construed as to make these small cases removable. There is no necessity for this provision of the bill being made any broader than it is now. It covers all of the cases that are included in the decision of the Supreme Court in the Carmack amendment; but under this decision our Federal courts, in my State at least, are being crowded with cases that involve anywhere from \$25 to \$100 growing out of damage suits on shipment cases; and, as my colleague has properly pointed out, the cost of trying them in the Federal courts often amounts to more than is involved in the case.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With pleasure.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the gentleman a member of the committee which has reported out a similar bill to this one?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not.

Mr. FOWLER. I thought the gentleman was and had had an opportunity to make a thorough investigation, though I suppose he has made that thorough investigation, being an attorney interested in such questions?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What I desire to know is whether the courts have construed the Federal Code which was passed in 1910 as giving the right to remove cases where the amount involved is less than \$3,000, growing out of the incident of the transportation as, for instance, the killing of a cow on the track by a railroad engaged in interstate commerce?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not so far as that, if I correctly understand the gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. They have not gone that far?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No.

Mr. FOWLER. They have been limited to the carriage and transportation of the article?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Growing directly out of the carriage and transportation, which was covered by what was called the Carmack amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. Not indirectly as an incident to that transportation. Is that true?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That has not been passed on, to my knowledge, by the Supreme Court, but I do not think it would so hold.

Mr. FOWLER. Has there been any case within the gentleman's knowledge where a removal has taken place for an injury which is incident to that transportation, such as an injury to a servant or a citizen?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I know of no such case as that, while I know of hundreds of cases that have been removed.

Mr. FOWLER. I thought the statement was made here on the floor of the House that such a holding has been made by some of the courts, and that removals had taken place in cases where a cow had been killed on the tracks.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I do not know of any such claim being made.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, permit me to suggest, if there is such a case I would love to see the color of the hair of the judge who so held. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With pleasure.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman explain just what the Carmack amendment was or what it amended?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It would take more time than the gentleman from Alabama has allowed me and the gentleman gave more than he desired to give.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me it is necessary to illumine this question.

Mr. CLAYTON. I shall not object to the gentleman taking the necessary time to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Carmack amendment in a general way, provided—

Mr. MURDOCK. It was an amendment to what, in the first place?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. An amendment to the interstate-commerce act and provided a regulation in reference to the recovery of damages in transportation cases, and I might say passed

with no intention such as was subsequently put into it by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I wanted to draw out, and I wanted to know what this Carmack amendment was.

Mr. CLAYTON. It made the initial road liable for the loss or injury to the property in transit after it passed out of the possession of the initial road.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, it seems it contained some phrase or sentence which was afterwards interpreted in such a manner as to make the passage of this law necessary. Just what was that?

Mr. CLAYTON. It does; but it does not at all relate to cases where live stock crossed the railroad; it does not relate to that at all, but relates entirely to the matter covered by the Carmack amendment—

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama this: What was the phrase in the Carmack amendment which afterwards, judicially interpreted, made this measure that we have up to-day necessary? What was that phrase?

Mr. CLAYTON. I had the Judicial Code here a while ago—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, if the gentleman will permit, there was no particular phrase. When these cases for damages sustained in interstate transportation first came up before the Federal courts on appeal from the State courts the objection was made that the State law did not control the right of recovery; but prior to the enactment of the Carmack amendment the Supreme Court of the United States held that as Congress had not legislated with reference to the matter that the State law would govern. The Carmack amendment to the interstate-commerce act made the initial or first carrier liable to the holder of a bill of lading for any loss or damage to the goods included therein caused either by the first carrier or any other to which the goods may have subsequently been delivered for further transportation. After the passage of this amendment the Supreme Court then held that State laws did not apply to this subject, Congress having legislated thereon. And it was further decided by the lower Federal courts that all cases arising under this amendment were removable to the Federal courts, as the removal statutes provided that all cases which involved a construction of any portion of the interstate-commerce acts could be removed to the Federal courts regardless of the amount involved.

Mr. CLAYTON. I have not the Carmack Act before me, but I have the Judicial Code. This Judicial Code, as the gentleman knows, was passed subsequent to the Carmack amendment, the Judicial Code undertaking to be a compilation of all such laws as the Carmack law and the civil statutes generally that might properly come under the designation of a judicial code. Section 24 of this code reads:

That the district court shall have original jurisdiction as follows: Of all suits of a civil nature at common law or in equity brought in the United States, or by any officer thereof authorized by law to sue, or between citizens of the same State—

And so forth and so on—

or where the matter in controversy exceeds, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum or value of \$3,000.

Now, that is perfectly plain.

Mr. MURDOCK. So far.

Mr. CLAYTON. Then here comes in the proviso:

Provided, however, That the foregoing provision as to the sum or value of the money in controversy shall not be construed to apply to any of the cases mentioned in the succeeding paragraphs of this section.

Now, what is the succeeding?

Eighth. Of all suits and proceedings arising under any law regulating commerce, except those suits and proceedings exclusive jurisdiction of which has been conferred upon the Commerce Court.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was that phrase that made the limitation?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; and this simple little bill rectifies that, so that if the gentleman shipped a carload of cattle from his home in Kansas and they got to Chicago and by fault of the railway injury happened to those cattle or death happened to those cattle, involving less than \$3,000, you can extend your action in the State court and not be subject to having to proceed to the Federal court.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad the gentleman explained it. I understand it now for the first time.

Mr. SHERLEY. In other words, this bill does what we thought we were doing when we passed the Judicial Code and raised the limit from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope to see an additional law passed which will prevent jurisdiction on the ground of adverse citizenship, on the basis of a corporation being a citizen of a State

where it is created, when in fact it is as much a citizen of the State where it is doing business as a corporation could be.

Mr. CLAYTON. I agree with the gentleman on that. Now, I want to say one word more, and then I will yield time. I want to say something more, Mr. Speaker, and the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] have suggested it to me. The surprising thing to those who have had reason to carefully study the Judicial Code is that so few errors were committed in that compilation. It may be a wrong construction on the part of the courts. But the courts have so held, and I think it is the duty of Congress to rectify the law so that the courts can not longer make such rulings as have been made. Now I will yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Just one moment further, if the gentleman please?

Mr. CLAYTON. Surely.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In just a moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to suggest to the gentleman that this is the process of the recall of judicial decisions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has not yielded the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. He yielded to me.

The SPEAKER. He has no right to yield. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] has the floor.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Alabama yielded a moment to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] I will say this, that when these cases for damages in interstate transportation came up before the Federal courts on appeal from the lower courts it was objected that the State courts would have no jurisdiction because it was purely an interstate matter, but at that time the Supreme Court of the United States held—that is, prior to the enactment of the Carmack amendment, which has just been read—that inasmuch as the Congress had not legislated with reference to shipment contracts, the State courts, until Congress had enacted that legislation, could take jurisdiction; but after the passage of the Carmack amendment, assuming jurisdiction over bills of lading and contracts of shipment, it was said that Congress had taken entire jurisdiction of the matter, and the whole matter was put in the control of Congress and was now subject to the statutes as an amendment to the interstate commerce act. That is the situation.

Mr. CLAYTON. Now, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a very necessary piece of legislation and ought to pass. The Carmack amendment gave a right of action against the initial carrier for damage to commodities transported in interstate commerce, and that amendment was carried into the Judicial Code. In the form in which it got into the Judicial Code in conjunction with the general jurisdictional provisions of the Federal court, the courts have construed it to mean that jurisdiction of all cases arising under the interstate-commerce law is in the courts of the United States, and that cases can be removed from the State courts to the Federal courts regardless of the amount involved. Consequently they take jurisdiction of all of these cases brought by small shippers of live stock and other commodities where damages are claimed against the railroad for losses incurred in shipment. It does not make any difference how small the loss is—it may be \$100, or \$50, or \$24—the cases have been removed from the State courts to the Federal courts. Manifestly that is a great oppression upon the small shipper of live stock. It causes great delay, and sometimes entirely consumes in costs the amount of his recovery.

I have introduced, I will say, in passing, a bill exactly of this same nature, H. R. 10315, at the request of the live-stock shippers of the Southwest. Before my bill was considered this bill had been passed by the Senate, and I am heartily in favor of this proposition. If the Federal courts are to continue to take jurisdiction of these small cases, they will need a justice of the peace to help them out, or a Federal commissioner to try these little cases, because it is utterly impossible for the Federal courts, with the business they have, to try these little damage cases. These cases for damages in shipment have been accumulating rapidly in the Southwest and West under this Carmack amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is the purpose of the corporation in appealing these cases to the Federal court chiefly to defeat the litigant by wearing him out?

Mr. BORLAND. I think it has been the policy of railroads ever since they have had litigation to defeat and wear out the litigants. They are inclined and prone to do that under any pretext, and if a claim involves less than \$3,000 it ought to be tried in the State where it is brought, and tried to a final conclusion.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is the gentleman sure that there is no phrase in this bill that will defeat that proposition?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I am not; but the bill seems to be prepared as carefully as can be, and the Congress is still in session, I will remind the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Is it not a fact that the Federal judges throughout the country are asking that this legislation be passed in order to relieve them of the litigation that is brought in the Federal courts from all parts of the country?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; I know that that is true.

Mr. GARNER. I know that two Federal judges in my State have called my attention to this legislation and stated that the law as it now stands was cluttering up their dockets, and that it was absolutely ridiculous to remove a case involving \$100 or \$50 from a justice's court up to them to be tried, and that there was need for this character of legislation.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not know what the attitude of the Federal judges is about it, but I know the attitude of the live-stock shippers, and they are unanimous for this legislation, and also unanimous for a similar piece of legislation which I have introduced and which is before the Interstate Commerce Committee. The railroads have put into their bills of lading a short limitation of time within which the shipper must give notice of damages and another short and unreasonable length of time in which he must bring suit.

In many cases that time is so short that he can not ascertain the facts through his factor or commission merchant or correspondent within the time that the bill of lading limits him; and the courts have actually decided that on the theory that he accepted a lower rate for the transportation of his goods he is bound by that time limit in his contract. On the other hand, if the railroad company had made a mistake on its side, and had quoted him too low a rate, and afterwards concluded that it would sue him for the difference between that and the true rate, there would be no limitation of time at all against the railroads up to the ordinary time fixed by the statute of limitations. But the railroads have put a limitation of 90 days within which a live-stock shipper or small shipper of any commodities transported in interstate commerce must ascertain the facts, serve notice, and bring suit if he expects to hold the carrier. I have a bill to remedy that. I am sorry it can not be embraced in the same section, because it remedies a defect of the interstate-commerce law.

As to this particular measure, I think there ought to be a unanimous vote in favor of it.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman yield me two minutes?

Mr. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York two minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is very curious that Congress always tries to lay the blame for its blunders on somebody else. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] thinks the corporations wanted to wear people out. I do not think any corporation had the slightest idea that this Carmack amendment would be put in that bill until Congress passed it. The gentleman from Alabama assumed that the decision of the court was wrong. Yet there is not a man in this House who will read the language of that Carmack amendment and the law to which it was applicable—

Mr. MADDEN. Except the lawyers.

Mr. PAYNE. There is not a man who will read it who will not come to the conclusion that the court was correct in its decision. In other words, the blunder was made by the Congress of the United States, and this is simply an effort to correct that blunder. That is all there is of it.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I have already said that I would ask to print the report of the House committee on the similar House bill, H. R. 9994, and I ask that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to print as a part of his remarks the report of the House committee on the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9994) to amend section 24, chapter 2, of the Judicial Code of the United States, report the same back with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

In the law fixing the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States it was originally provided that in a suit brought by a citizen of one State in the courts of that State against a citizen of another State the cause may be removed upon petition of the latter from the State court to the circuit court of the United States, provided "the amount in dispute, exclusive of costs, exceeds the sum or value of \$500."

By the act of August 13, 1888, the amount was increased to \$2,000, so that causes could not be removed unless the amount in controversy exceeded \$2,000.

Subsequently the amount was again increased to \$3,000.

It is well known that this limitation of the right of removal is of especial value in suits against railroads, especially the large companies whose lines extend through many States and whose "citizenship" is held to be in the State from which the company's charter was obtained. In actions brought against the company in a State through which the line runs, and probably in which the plaintiff lives, and the injury or loss occurred, suits brought for trivial amounts could be transferred from the State to the United States courts, on the motion of the railroad company, were it not for this limitation of the right of removal to amounts exceeding \$3,000.

In the Judicial Code, enacted March 3, 1911, and in force since January 1, 1912, wherein the laws affecting the removal of causes from State to United States courts were revised and codified, it was provided (ch. 2, sec. 24) that the district courts shall have original jurisdiction "where the matter in controversy exceeds, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum or value of \$3,000" and "is between citizens of different States."

That would have left the law substantially as it was. But at the close of this first paragraph of section 24 is the following proviso:

"Provided, however, That the foregoing provision as to the sum or value of the matter in controversy shall not be construed to apply to any of the cases mentioned in the succeeding paragraph of this section."

Paragraph 8 of the section provides:

"Of all suits and proceedings arising under any law regulating commerce."

So that the statute taken together is to the effect that in cases brought by a citizen of one State against another no right of removal exists unless the amount in controversy exceeds \$3,000, except in "suits and proceedings arising under any law regulating commerce." In all such cases the right of removal would exist, no matter what the amount in controversy was.

It is not likely the effect was intended which a literal application of this latest utterance of the legislative power gives. For it makes of no value the limitation of amount in the right of removal in nearly all cases against the railroads.

In *Adams Express Co. v. Croninger* (226 U. S., 491) it was held that section 20 of the Interstate-commerce act as amended by the act of June 20, 1906, abrogates all State and common law liabilities on interstate shipments of property. If in any case this statute does not give the plaintiff the right of recovery, he has none. That being true, all cases against railroad companies for loss or damage on interstate shipments of necessity must arise under a "law regulating commerce."

It follows that in all cases when the controversy arises as to an interstate contract for carriage, no matter what the amount in dispute, they must be tried in the United States courts under the law as it now stands.

The condition of the law and the repeal by the Judicial Code of the limitation on the right of removal was not called to the attention of the bar and the courts until May 14, 1913, when Judge Amidon handed down the decision of *McGoon v. Northern Pacific Railway Co.*, United States District Court of North Dakota, reported in 204 Federal Reporter, 998.

In that case several separate actions were brought against the Northern Pacific Railway Co. for damage to live stock shipped by plaintiffs on defendant's road from North Dakota and Montana to Chicago. In no action was the amount in controversy \$3,000. The suits were removed on defendant's petition from the State to the United States court, and in that court a motion was made to remand the suits to the State court—

1. Because the amount in controversy is less than \$3,000, the sum required to justify their removal.

2. Because the suits did not involve a Federal question.

It was held that a suit by a shipper against a railroad company to recover for damages or injury to property while being transported in interstate commerce is one arising under the interstate-commerce act as amended, of which a Federal district court is given exclusive original jurisdiction by the Judicial Code, which confers jurisdiction on such courts of all suits and proceedings arising under any law regulating commerce; and such a suit is removable under section 28, without regard to the amount involved.

The motions to remand were denied.

Since this decision was published hundreds of cases, many of them involving small amounts, have been removed. Every day now cases are removed at the instance of the defendant railroad companies when the amount in controversy is less than \$3,000.

An attorney writes:

"Under the recent construction given to paragraph 8, section 24, chapter 2, of the Judicial Code of the United States, the railroad companies are permitted to transfer all cases brought for damages on account of delay or injury to shipment of goods, regardless of the amount in controversy. How this operates was demonstrated at our Federal court, where a little justice of the peace case from Eldon was transferred to the District Court of the United States for trial. We do not believe that Congress ever intended that cases of this character should all be tried in the Federal court. It is a hardship and an injustice to require a person whose claim is small to go into the Federal court to litigate it."

Another writes:

"I have a case which is transferred to the United States court where the matter in controversy is less than \$500. Under the law as it is now construed if a person ships 30 cents' worth of apples across a State line and they are injured he must bring his suit for damages in a United States court."

Another lawyer with a very extensive practice writes:

"So far as I know all district judges are now removing causes when an interstate shipment is involved, no matter how small the amount in controversy."

A trial judge of a State court writes:

"I have followed Judge Amidon's decision with reluctance and have removed all cases regardless of the amount involved. Unless the law is changed I see no way to avoid it, and it will work great hardship and be very burdensome to shippers."

Another judge writes:

"I was compelled to remove a suit from my court to the United States court in which the plaintiff claimed a damage of \$100, by reason of injury to horses in transit from Mount Ayr to Chicago. I did not want to follow Judge Amidon's decision, but found upon examination of the present provisions of the law that there was no way to avoid it."

Another lawyer writes:

"At a recent term of district court here 10 cases in which I appeared for plaintiffs were removed to the Federal court. In one of these cases a lady shipped her household effects from Red Oak, Iowa, to a point in Montana. Subsequently she concluded to remain in Iowa, and ordered her goods reshipped. When received several boxes had been opened and much clothing stolen. The furniture was so badly damaged and broken as to be worthless. The railway company refused to allow her claim and she brought suit in the State court. The railway company removed it to the United States court. She is poor and will be unable to prosecute the case and must lose her claim."

Another case:

A farmer ships a carload of cattle for feeding. In transferring from the feeding yards to the car the company's employees allow a steer to escape. Suit is brought and the case is transferred to the United States courts.

A railroad lawyer, who has no sympathy with such procedure, says that more than 250 cases have been removed in the State of Iowa alone since Judge Amidon's decision.

An Iowa lawyer writes:

"We have had a number of cases against railroads for clients who have bona fide claims for damages, and under present conditions we have to tell them to take their loss and say nothing about it, for they can not afford to take their witnesses, hire attorneys, and travel over 100 miles to the United States court at Sioux City when the amount is one or two hundred dollars."

Another writes:

"I see no relief for the shipper of small articles unless the law is changed, for it will not pay to take each little individual case of loss to the Federal courts. The railroads, knowing this, refuse to pay, and thus a great loss in the aggregate occurs. Certainly this is not justice nor fair play."

Many others might be given, but enough has been quoted to show conditions as they actually exist and the necessity for speedy action.

It is to remedy this and to restore the limitation as it existed before the adoption of the present Judicial Code that this act is proposed.

As introduced it is as follows:

The first provision inserts after the last line of the first paragraph of section 24 the words "except as provided in paragraph 8," so that the proviso will read:

"Provided, however, That the foregoing provision as to the sum or value of the matter in controversy shall not be construed to apply to any of the cases mentioned in the succeeding paragraphs of this section, except as provided in paragraph 8."

The second provision of the bill strikes out the words "except those suits and proceedings, exclusive jurisdiction of which has been conferred upon the Commerce Court"—this because the exception is no longer necessary since the Commerce Court has been abolished.

In lieu of the words thus stricken is the proviso proposed, so that the eighth paragraph of section 24 shall read as follows:

"Of all suits and proceedings arising under any law regulating commerce: *Provided, however,* That in suits now pending or hereafter brought in State courts based upon contract or agreement for transportation, or for failure to perform a duty imposed by law to person or property, or for delay, injury, damage, or loss to any property in the carriage, transporting, receiving, and delivery thereof, against any common carrier, railroad, or transportation company, and where the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, is less than \$3,000, the jurisdiction shall be and remain in said State court until final determination, and shall not be transferred on motion or otherwise to any court of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. CLAYTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was ordered to lie on the table.

By unanimous consent, the bill H. R. 9994 was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those gentlemen who have spoken on this bill have the privilege of extending their remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asks unanimous consent that those Members who made remarks on the bill which has just passed the House have the privilege of extending their remarks in the Record.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Reserving the right to object, I assume that the remarks which will be printed will relate to the subject matter of these bills.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken on the railroad bill, which has just passed the House, be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record on that subject. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think there ought to be a limit on the time.

Mr. TOWNER. Make it five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. Within five legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, reported a bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 165), ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] reserves all points of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, on account of the absence of two or three members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and the desire of others to postpone the consideration of this bill for a short while, I give notice that it will not be called up for consideration until next Thursday.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file the views of the minority on this bill.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH], I desire to give him an opportunity to file minority views on this bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will file my views to-morrow.

Mr. MOON. The minority, I think, will file separate views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] asks unanimous consent to file his views on this bill, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH] have the right to file his views.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that all members of the committee who desire to do so may avail themselves of the privilege of filing minority views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that every member of the committee who desires to do so have leave to file his views. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 13, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Oklawaha River to Lake Dora, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 514); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Richmond Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 515); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

3. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion in the case of the Trustees Baptist Church of Bloomfield, Ky., v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 519); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact in the case of Sallie A. Kinnaird, administratrix of the estate of William H. Kinnaird, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 520); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a detailed statement of expenses of officers and employees of the Department of Labor in attending meetings and conventions during the period from June 30 to December 1, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 560); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, inviting attention to the urgent need of an appropriation for special physicochemical and metabolic studies of pellagra (H. Doc. No. 559); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a detailed statement of all expenses of attendance of officers or

employees of the Library of Congress at meetings or conventions that have been incurred from June 30, 1913, to December 1, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 574); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a statement of expenses incurred by officers and employees of the Department of Commerce in attending meetings or conventions of societies and associations during the period from June 30 to December 1, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 561); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report by the auditor of the District of Columbia showing the expenses incurred and paid by the District of Columbia for certain of its employees in attending meetings of associations or conventions under authority of the commissioners from June 30 to December 1, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 575); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the acting superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building, submitting an estimate of appropriations in the sum of \$5,000 for fuel, lights, repairs, and miscellaneous items for the new Navy Department annex for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 566); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting certain estimates of appropriation for the service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 567); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Acting Superintendent State, War, and Navy Department Buildings, submitting urgent estimates of appropriations required for the new Navy Department Annex for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 565); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a schedule of papers and documents which are not needed in the transaction of public business and which have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 576); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Attorney General submitting an urgent estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for rent of court rooms, United States courts, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 564); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of State submitting urgent estimates of appropriations required by the Department of State during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 563); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting copy of a communication from certain steamship companies relating to a provision for the safeguarding of the coast of Alaska (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of reports, together with maps, from the superintendent in charge of the Shoshone Indian School and the assistant engineer of the Shoshone irrigation project, in Wyoming, pertaining to the construction of roads and bridges on the Wind River Reservation (H. Doc. No. 516); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

18. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Au Gres River, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 517); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

19. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination of New York Harbor, N. Y., Upper Bay, and plan and estimate of cost of improvement, with a view to improving channel opposite anchorage grounds (H. Doc. No. 518); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

20. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel sloop *Elisa*, in the cases of Charles T. Lovering, administrator of Joseph Taylor, v. The United States, and John H. Moriarty, administrator of James

Scott, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 558); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel brig *Rensselaer*, in the cases of Joseph Ogden, surviving executor, etc., of Jane Ann Ferrers, *v. The United States*, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 530); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Auditor for the Post Office Department submitting a list of postmasters found to be indebted to the Government in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, and who on December 29, 1913, had not paid the amounts due into the Treasury of the United States (H. Doc. No. 568); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department and ordered to be printed.

23. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel ship *Jefferson*, in the case of Charles T. Lovering, administrator of Joseph Taylor, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 554); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel schooner *Bellona*, in the case of Elijah K. Hubbard, administrator of Jacob Sebor, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 546); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel schooner *John*, in the case of Ludlow Ogden, administrator of George Barneswall, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 545); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

26. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel ship *Pigon*, in the case of Elijah H. Hubbard, administrator of Jacob Sebor, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 553); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

27. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Gideon*, in the cases of George Haskell, administrator de bonis non of Solomon Haskell, *v. The United States*, and Eben B. Foster and Augustus F. Lemon, administrators of Ignatius Haskell, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 544); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

28. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *Jay*, in the cases of Charles T. Lovering, administrator of Joseph Taylor, *v. The United States*, and Charles F. Hunt, administrator of Joseph Russell, surviving partner of Jeffrey & Russell, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 529); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Mercury*, in the case of Brooks Adams, administrator of Peter C. Brooks, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 543); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

30. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *Sally*, in the case of Brooks Adams, administrator of Peter C. Brooks, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 528); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

31. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel schooner *Richmond*, in the cases of R. Manson Smith, administrator of Francis Smith, *v. The United States*, and Henry A. T. Granbery, administrator of John Granbery, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 542); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

32. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel brig *Esperanza*, in the case of Elijah K. Hubbard, administrator of Jacob Sebor, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 527); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

33. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel ship *Joseph*, in the

cases of T. B. Blecher, J. R. and Charles C. Leary, receivers of the New York Insurance Co., *v. The United States*, and Augustus W. Clason, administrator, etc., of Isaac Clason, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 550); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

34. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel schooner *Benevolence*, in the case of Isaac H. Coffin, administrator of Abiel Wood, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 541); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

35. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel ship *Diana*, in the cases of Elijah K. Sebor, administrator of Jacob Sebor, *v. The United States*, and Richard Delafield, administrator of John Delafield, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 549); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

36. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Two Friends*, in the case of Robert Hartshorne, administrator of Richard Hartshorne, surviving partner of Rhinelander, Hartshorne & Co., *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 540); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

37. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Adventure*, in the case of John H. Maynadier, administrator of Jeremiah Yellott, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 539); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

38. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Atlantic*, in the cases of Charles T. Lovering, administrator of Joseph Taylor, *v. The United States*, and Charles T. Lovering, administrator of Joseph Taylor, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 538); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

39. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Lark*, in the case of Charles T. Lovering, administrator of Joseph Taylor, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 537); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

40. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel sloop *Eliza*, in the case of Charles T. Lovering, administrator of Joseph Taylor, *v. The United States*, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 551); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

41. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *Recovery*, in the case of Eliza N. Blunt and Eliza S. Blunt, administratrices of John Sinclair, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 526); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

42. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and the conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *Pearl*, in the cases of the President and Directors of the Insurance Co. of North America *v. The United States* and Ezra Bander, administrator of Philip Case, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 525); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

43. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and the conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Molly Farlie*, in the case of the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 536); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

44. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *Hiram*, in the cases of William A. M. Fuller, administrator of John Leamy, *v. The United States* and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 524); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

45. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Patriot*, in the cases of William Bush, administrator of Thomas Keen, *v. The United States* and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 535); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

46. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel sloop *Ranger*, in the cases of Brooks Adams, administrator of Peter C. Brooks, *v.*

The United States, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 557); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

47. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *Industry*, in the case of James G. Freeman, receiver of the Boston Marine Insurance Co., v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 523); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

48. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *Luna*, in the cases of Henry B. Cabot, administrator of William Gray, v. The United States and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 522); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

49. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Industry*, in the cases of Jeremiah Nelson, administrator of Jeremiah Nelson, v. The United States and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 534); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

50. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel ship *Commerce*, in the cases of Eliza F. Noyes, administratrix of Benjamin Frothingham, v. The United States and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 548); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

51. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Delight* in the cases of William S. Squires, administrator of Henry Pratt, surviving partner of Pratt & Kintzing, v. The United States, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 533); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

52. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel ship *Ann and Mary* in the cases of Louise A. Starkweather, administratrix of Richard E. Hallett, v. The United States, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 552); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

53. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Three Friends* in the cases of Brooks Adams, administrator of Peter C. Brooks, v. The United States, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 532); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

54. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *Iris* in the cases of John C. Hollister, administrator of Thomas Ward, v. The United States, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 521); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

55. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel sloop *Rising Sun* in the cases of Elijah K. Hubbard, administrator of Jacob Sebor, v. The United States, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 556); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

56. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel ship *Polly*, in the case of Joseph S. Webster, administrator of Thomas Webster, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 547); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

57. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel schooner *Chance*, in the cases of Waldo H. Warner, administrator of Simeon Williams, v. The United States and Albert Galpin, administrator of Hahn Woodhouse, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 531); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

58. A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel sloop *Catherine*, in the case of Henry J. Dubois, administrator of John Peterson, v. The United States and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 555); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

59. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill for the better protection of national military parks (H. Doc. No. 578); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of War, submitting a supplementary estimate of appropriation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 562); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

61. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Auditor for the State and Other Departments showing officers and administrative departments and officers of the Government delinquent in rendering or transmitting accounts or in payment of balances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 569); to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department and ordered to be printed.

62. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Auditor of the Interior Department showing delinquencies of officers of said department in rendering or transmitting their accounts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 570); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and ordered to be printed.

63. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report from the Auditor of the Navy Department showing delinquencies in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Navy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 571); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department and ordered to be printed.

64. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report from the Auditor of the War Department showing in detail delinquencies of accounting officers in War Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 572); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

65. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report from the Auditor of the Treasury Department showing delinquencies of accounting officers of the Treasury Department and undeposited balances for the fiscal year 1913 (H. Doc. No. 573); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills of the House, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 11269) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, accompanied by a report (No. 164), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9854) granting a pension to Ruth E. Hering, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 11270) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sparta, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11271) to provide for the erection of a public building at Herrin, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11272) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Alva Post, No. 28, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Oklahoma, Alva, Okla., two cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11273) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Grant Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla., two cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 11274) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to cause to be struck and issued to each of the officers, men of the Navy and Marine Corps, serving on the U. S. S. *Keatsarge*, United States Navy, at the time of her encounter with the *Alabama*, a medal commemorative of such service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 11275) to enlarge, extend, remodel, etc., post-office building at Rockford, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 11276) to provide for reimbursing rural free-delivery carriers of the mails for expenses incurred in providing and maintaining equipments used in the discharge of their official duties to the extent of 25 per cent of their monthly compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 11277) to provide a keeper's house for the lighthouse keeper at Crown Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 11278) to regulate the payment of salaries of clerks in the sea post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 11279) to provide for the taxation of intangible personal property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 11280) providing for the completion of the Bronx River (New York City) improvement; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 11281) making an appropriation to repair and build a levee around the national cemetery in Pulaski County, Ill.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 11282) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Rochelle, N. Y., one condemned bronze gun and three pyramids of shell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 11283) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the navigable waters of St. Andrews Bay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11284) to relinquish the title of the United States to certain land in the city of Pensacola, Fla., to Agnes Moore, widow of the late James Wilkins; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 11285) providing for the appointment of a board of survey for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant at or near Evansville, Ind., and submitting an estimate of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 11286) to authorize certain changes in homestead allotments of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 11287) providing for the appointment of a board of survey for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant at or near the navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and submitting an estimate of the cost thereon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 11288) to establish a marine fish-cultural station in the State of Texas in the vicinity of Galveston; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 11289) authorizing a survey with a view to protection of the beach at and near Seabright, N. J., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 11290) providing for the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 11291) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Blytheville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 11292) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11293) providing for the establishment of a Bureau of Public Highways, and for the cooperation of the National Government in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of public roads and highways in the several States; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11294) providing for the appointment of a board of survey for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant at or near Paducah, Ky., and submitting an estimate of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11295) to authorize a survey of the waters between Staten Island and Hoffman Island in the lower New York Bay, N. Y., for the purpose of opening a channel therein for the benefit of navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Utah: A bill (H. R. 11296) appropriating the sum of \$50,000 to the State of Utah, to reimburse said State for money paid to members of Territorial militia for service rendered in suppressing of Indian hostilities in the Territory of Utah prior to the year 1873; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11297) providing for the removal of obstructions from Green and Grand Rivers, in the State of Utah, and making appropriation for the same; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 11298) providing for the construction and equipment of a storehouse at Benicia Arsenal, State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 11299) to enlarge, extend, and make additions to, fireproof, and further improve the post-

office building at Shenandoah, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 11300) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue field gun and mount to San Diego Army and Navy Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 11301) providing for additional equipment at the Puget Sound Naval Station; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. AVIS: A bill (H. R. 11302) to amend section 1104 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11303) to amend section 826 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 11304) to acquire a site for a public building at Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 11305) to prevent postmasters who were soldiers of the Civil and Spanish Wars from being discharged without cause or on account of age, and to exempt them from civil-service examinations; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 11306) to provide for enlarging the United States building at Findlay, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 11308) to provide for the erection or purchase of an armor-plate factory; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11309) to authorize and legalize the exchange of certain lands between the United States and the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 11310) providing for a second homestead entry where the entryman has purchased by competitive bid for a price equivalent to \$5 or more per acre; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 11311) to amend sections 3233 and 3243 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to internal-revenue taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 11312) to permit the Secretary of War to issue, without expense to the United States, for use in target practice, magazine rifles and appendages therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 11313) to provide for mobile defense for Pacific coast ports; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET (by request): A bill (H. R. 11314) to prevent the disturbance by undue immigration of the scale of wages and of the social and economic conditions of the population of the United States and to prevent the evasion of the immigration, naturalization, and sanitary laws and regulations; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 11315) providing for the erection of a public building at Gaylord, in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11316) providing for the employment of an engineer to take charge of the work for controlling the flood waters of the Puyallup, White, and Stuck Rivers, and other streams in King and Pierce Counties, State of Washington; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRAY: A bill (H. R. 11317) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Newcastle, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 11318) authorizing the sale of lands in Lyman County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 11319) making an appropriation for rebuilding, improving, and strengthening the levee on the Mississippi River at Columbus, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11320) making an appropriation for the rebuilding, improvement, and strengthening of the levee on the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11321) providing for the registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MCCOY: A bill (H. R. 11322) to regulate the holding of bank directorships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 11323) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 11324) authorizing the disposal of a portion of the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 11325) to authorize the reconstruction of the existing toll bridge across the Hudson River at Troy, in the State of New York, and the maintenance of the bridge so reconstructed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11326) for the improvement of the Narrows of Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 11327) to repeal "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, amendments approved February 5, 1903, and June 15, 1906; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 11328) providing for the holding of the United States District and Circuit Courts at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 11329) to transfer the Army transport service from the War Department to the Navy Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11330) reestablishing the grade of vice admiral in the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 11331) to repeal an act regulating the construction of bridges across the Muskingum River in Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 11332) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by act of February 16, 1885, as amended by act of March 23, 1906, as amended by act of June 19, 1906; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 11333) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into contract for use by the Government of dry docks at Hunters Point, San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 11334) to construct and equip a small tender and barge for use in the eighth lighthouse district; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 11335) providing for an additional associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 11336) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and transport to Alaska for breeding purposes a band of yaks, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11337) to prohibit threats, expressed or implied, by employers of labor calculated to influence the political actions of workmen or employees in congressional elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 361) making certain inquiries from the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 362) requesting the President of the United States, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 363) making certain inquiries from the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Resolution (H. Res. 364) directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the New York Central, Michigan Central, and Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway as to interlocking directorates and incorporate stock control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 185) authorizing the President to withdraw public lands containing carnotite, pitchblende, or other radium-bearing ores and minerals; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FERRIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 186) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from entry any public lands containing radium; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. NELSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 187) to direct the Public Printer to prepare a brief table of contents for the daily editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (Stat. L., vol. 34, p. 56); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 189) directing the Secretary of War to permit the city of Chicago to erect permanent bridges across the Chicago River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 11269) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 11339) granting an increase of pension to William Marvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11340) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Frazer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11341) granting an increase of pension to Newton S. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11342) granting an increase of pension to Lyman R. Blossom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11343) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jean Petit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AVIS: A bill (H. R. 11344) granting an increase of pension to Levi W. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 11345) granting a pension to Mark Curtsinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11346) granting a pension to Nettie L. Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11347) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Ellery P. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 11348) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Payne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTON: A bill (H. R. 11349) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Meehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 11350) to place the name of Capt. George W. Abel upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11351) granting an increase of pension to John W. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 11352) for the relief of Samuel T. King; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11353) granting an increase of pension to Elmer R. Chamness; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11354) granting a pension to George W. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11355) granting an increase of pension to R. M. C. Gavin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11356) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Rudrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 11357) for the relief of A. H. Thompson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11358) granting an increase of pension to John H. Agner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 11359) extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. L., p. 851), to the claim of the estate of Montford T. Johnson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11360) granting an increase of pension to Nathan J. Kilby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 11361) granting an increase of pension to George E. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11362) granting an increase of pension to S. B. Bohanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11363) granting an increase of pension to George M. Trickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11364) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 11365) granting a pension to Julian C. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11366) granting an increase of pension to William Yandell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 11367) granting a pension to Kate H. Vosburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11368) granting a pension to Mary A. June; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11369) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Rutherford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11370) for the relief of William Heine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11371) granting a pension to Lauchling McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11372) granting an increase of pension to Michael Sheehy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11373) granting an increase of pension to Emmett M. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11374) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Greenfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11375) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Barney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11376) for the relief of Spencer D. Gleason; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 11377) for the relief of Archibald Craig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11378) for the relief of John W. Willey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11379) granting an increase of pension to George Creelman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 11380) for the relief of the estate of Jeremiah O'Keefe; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11381) for the relief of the estate of T. J. Semmes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 11382) granting a pension to Thomas H. Woods; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 11383) granting an increase of pension to James Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11384) for the relief of Ivy L. Merrill; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11385) granting an increase of pension to Belle Oldham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11386) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Warder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11387) granting an increase of pension to Perry G. P. Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11388) for the relief of the legal representatives and heirs of Jacob Neace, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11389) for the relief of B. F. Fugate; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11390) for the relief of Jeremiah Hunt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11391) for the relief of Dr. F. M. Carter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11392) for the relief of the legal representatives and heirs of James Noble, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11393) to correct the military record of Thomas C. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11394) for the relief of James A. Powers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11395) for the relief of Andrew Dougherty and Edward J. Dougherty, executors of the estate of Andrew Dougherty, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 11396) granting a pension to Clinton C. Coventry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 11397) for the relief of Frank Kreuger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 11398) granting an increase of pension to Frances W. Stoddard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11399) granting a pension to Mary K. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11400) for the relief of the widow of James Russell Cochrane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11401) to provide for the erection of a monument to perpetuate the memory of William R. Smith, late superintendent of the Botanical Gardens; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 11402) for the relief of Robert C. McManus, administrator of the estate of R. O. W. McManus, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 11403) for the relief of Thomas Bingham; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11404) for the relief of the claimants to the Coppinger grant, in the county of San Mateo, State of California, and all other persons claiming title to portions of said grant by mesne conveyances from Juan Coppinger; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 11405) granting an increase of pension to Stephen S. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11406) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Greendale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11407) granting a pension to Nancy E. Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 11408) granting an increase of pension to Joshua J. Steckel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11409) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Hoag; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 11410) granting an increase of pension to Peter Risban; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 11411) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Malsom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11412) granting an increase of pension to James S. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11413) granting a pension to Harry Yates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11414) granting an increase of pension to William E. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11415) granting an increase of pension to John Shaller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11416) for the relief of J. C. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11417) granting an increase of pension to Joshua H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11418) granting an increase of pension to William N. Grandstaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11419) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Arnholt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11420) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Bibb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11421) granting an increase of pension to John P. Kellogg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11422) granting an increase of pension to David Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11423) to correct the military record of Henry C. James; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11424) to correct the military record of Thomas S. Fleming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11425) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11426) granting a pension to Jessie Byerly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 11427) granting an increase of pension to Ignacious Wanker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11428) granting a pension to Mary J. Neary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11429) granting an increase of pension to Eguene J. Boblits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11430) granting a pension to W. O. B. Tibbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11431) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Richie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11432) granting an increase of pension to Adeline L. Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11433) granting an increase of pension to William O'Bryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11434) granting an increase of pension to Wiley Gullett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 11435) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Corn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 11436) granting a pension to Katherine Hempen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11437) granting a pension to Minnie A. Cullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11438) granting a pension to Ellen M. Haney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11439) granting a pension to Katie A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11440) granting an increase of pension to Isabel E. Kearns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 11441) granting a pension to Lelia E. Bowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHAN: A bill (H. R. 11442) granting a pension to William Keefe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 11443) granting an increase of pension to Morton A. Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 11444) for the relief of the Delaware Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11445) granting an increase of pension to James P. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11446) granting an increase of pension to Elias Worley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11447) granting an increase of pension to David Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11448) granting an increase of pension to Melissa A. Fore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11449) for the relief of Morris S. Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11450) to correct the military record of William H. Wyatt and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 11451) granting an increase of pension to Jesse C. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11452) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11453) granting an increase of pension to Adam R. Zimmerle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11454) granting an increase of pension to James Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11455) granting a pension to Alfred J. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11456) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11457) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Traugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11458) granting an increase of pension to John Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11459) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11460) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11461) granting an increase of pension to B. F. Ridenour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11462) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Bowyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 11463) granting a pension to Mary S. Eugene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11464) granting a pension to Thomas B. Lumpkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11465) granting a pension to Charlotte P. Grizzle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11466) granting a pension to Charles C. Abernathy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11467) granting an increase of pension to John A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 11468) granting an increase of pension to Charles Imick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11469) granting a pension to Mrs. Louisa Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11470) granting a pension to Elmer E. Frederick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 11471) granting a pension to Nabbe E. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 11472) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Harrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11473) granting an increase of pension to Henry Fawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11474) granting an increase of pension to William J. Finley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11475) granting a pension to Mary J. Brophy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11476) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Dorwart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11477) granting an increase of pension to John M. Schaler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11478) for the relief of Frank Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11479) granting an increase of pension to Michael N. Musselman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11480) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gourley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11481) granting an increase of pension to Alfred E. Neal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11482) granting an increase of pension to David M. Kinsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11483) to correct the military record of Thomas F. Lindesmith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11484) to correct the military record of Ralph Cloud; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 11485) granting a pension to Robert Whittaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 11486) granting an increase of pension to Addison Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 11487) granting a pension to John Mayfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11488) granting a pension to Malinda Jane Wall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11489) granting an increase of pension to James Hildrith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11490) granting an increase of pension to William R. Calvert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11491) granting an increase of pension to James A. Trail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11492) granting an increase of pension to Eddie Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11493) granting an increase of pension to Malcom G. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11494) granting an increase of pension to Tabitha P. Bissett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 11495) granting a pension to Sophronia E. Whipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11496) granting a pension to Helen M. Emery R., and Glenia N. Sarver, minor children of Doctor E. Sarver; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11497) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alexander B. Stevenson and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 11498) for the relief of the estate of George Neitzey, deceased, surviving partner of Neitzey & Acker; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 11499) granting a pension to Nels B. Olson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11500) granting an increase of pension to Maggy Van Wert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 11501) granting a pension to Samuel S. Householder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11502) granting a pension to Olive Dixon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 11503) for the relief of Tennis W. Wade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11504) granting an increase of pension to Moses Reeves, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 11505) granting a pension to John A. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 11506) for the relief of the heirs of Salvador Costa; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 11507) for the relief of A. Purdee; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WOODS: A bill (H. R. 11508) granting a pension to George Duryea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11509) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Pannell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11510) for the relief of John T. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Andrew Jackson Branch of the American Continental League of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against an appropriation for the celebration of the hun-

dred years of peace with England; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of headquarters George Washington Branch of the American Continental League of Connecticut, Danbury, Conn., protesting against an appropriation by Congress for celebrating 100 years of peace with English-speaking peoples; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), petition of the Vinegar Hill Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against any appropriation by Congress for the celebration of 100 years of peace with English-speaking peoples; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), memorial of John A. Rawlins Post, No. 128, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill 11112, relative to erection of a memorial to the reunion of the Union and Confederate Armies at Gettysburg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of the State of Washington, approving the Federal reserve act and requesting the location of a Federal reserve bank in the city of Seattle; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also (by request), resolutions of the Robert Emmet Literary Society, of Wilmerding, Pa.; of the Washington Branch of the American Continental League, of Youngstown, Ohio; of the Jefferson Branch of the American Continental League, of New Bedford, Mass.; of the Matthew Thornton Branch of the American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Washington Branch of the American Continental League, of Pittsfield, Mass.; of the Affiliated Branch of the American Continental League, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; of the Andrew Jackson Branch of the American Continental League, of Wilmerding, Pa.; of the Commodore Barry Branch of the American Continental League, of Jersey City, N. J.; of the United Irish-American Societies of Greater New York; of the Abraham Lincoln Branch of the American Continental League, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; of the Thomas Jefferson Branch of the American Continental League, of Graysferry Road, Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Rochester (N. Y.) Branch of the American Continental League; and of the Jefferson Club of the seventeenth ward, protesting against Congress appropriating funds for the celebration of the so-called "100 years of peace among English-speaking people"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions of the Saugus Socialist Club, of Colorado; the Leadwood Miners' Union, of Leadwood, Mo.; of the Desloge (Mo.) Socialist; of the Branch Millville, of Millville, N. J.; of the Local Louisiana; of the Women's Trade Union League, of New York City; of Local Union No. 298, United Mine Workers of America, of Richmond, Mo.; and of the Voorhees Township, Branch No. 1, Socialist Party Local, of Gibbsboro, N. J., requesting congressional investigation of the Colorado coal and the Michigan copper mine strikes; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petitions of the German-American Alliance, of Johnstown, Pa.; Bridgeport, Conn.; and Kansas City, Mo.; of the Cook County (Ill.) commissioners; and of the City Council of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the educational test in the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of licensed officers of the United States employed in the service of the Southern Pacific Co., Atlantic steamship lines, directing attention to inconsistencies in Senate bill 136, to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), petition of King County Central Committee of the Socialist Party of Washington, favoring passage of Senate bill 4; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), resolution of the Connecticut Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring legislation for Federal control of the water powers; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), resolution adopted by State administrators of vocational education in New York City December 13, 1913, favoring Senate joint resolution 5, providing for the appointment of a commission to consider the need and report a plan for national aid to vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), petition of John M. Mott, of South Haven, Mich., favoring the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also (by request): Petition of citizens of Illinois, favoring an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petitions of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce and the Central Democratic Club of Harrisburg, Pa., congratulating Congress on the adoption of the bank-

ing and currency law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 8889, a special bill for the relief of Rebecca L. Scarbrough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Memorial of the Illinois State Horticultural Society, protesting against the enactment of any legislation fixing a standard box for the packing of apples; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of citizens of twenty-first and twenty-second wards of the city of Chicago, and of the twenty-fifth ward branch of the Socialist Party of Chicago, Ill., relative to labor conditions in Michigan and other parts of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Board of Commissioners of Cook County, Ill., protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request): Petition of the officers and members of Branch 31 of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada, at Spring City, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 1873 and Senate bill 927; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of seventh congressional district of Pennsylvania, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of State administrators of vocational education, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 5 relative to vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the New York State Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States, favoring the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARTER: Memorial of Local Union No. 1811, United Mine Workers of America, favoring an investigation by Congress of the conditions in the mining districts of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of Local Unions Nos. 1811, 1170, 2070, and 1778, United Mine Workers of America, in Oklahoma, advocating a congressional investigation of strike situation in Michigan and Government ownership of copper mines; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Forrest Lake and numerous other citizens of the city of Sanford, Fla., favoring the passage of the bill extending the benefit of the pension laws to the United States Military Telegraph Corps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Kissimmee Council, No. 27, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Kissimmee, Fla., asking for the passage of House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of the common council of the city of Marine City, Mich., and Shipmasters' Association, Lodge No. 8, protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill in its present form; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Cigar Makers' Union No. 368, of Port Huron, Mich., favoring congressional investigation of the copper miners' strike and for Government ownership of such mines; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of William Sanborn Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Port Huron, Mich., favoring the passage of a bill for the payment of pension accrued at death of a pensioner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Civil War veterans of Auburn, Me., in behalf of House bill 8605; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Sanilac County, Mich., protesting against the passage of the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of Dr. J. B. G. Dixon and other physicians and specialists of Huron County, Mich., protesting against the Federal medical board bill (H. R. 8603); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of Commodore Stockton Camp, No. 4, Department of California, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring legislation by Congress for the payment of pensions to veterans and widows of deceased soldiers, sailors, marines, and Revenue Service men; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Rawlins Relief Corps, No. 29, and Rawlins Post, No. 23, Department of California and Nevada, favoring monthly payment by Congress of all pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: Petition to accompany House bill 7351, a bill for the relief of Julia Halloran; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolution of the New York State Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution adopted by State administrators of vocational education in New York City December 13, 1913, favoring passage of Senate joint resolution 5, providing for a national commission on vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of N. H. White & Co., of New York City, requesting certain modifications to the income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Antislavery League of Hawaii, favoring the passage of the Gronna bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of Consumers' League of New York State, favoring eight-hour bill for women employed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition to accompany bill for relief of Llewellyn A. Cole, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the Building Trades Council of Minneapolis, Minn., relative to conditions existing in the copper mining districts of Michigan; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Nicollet County (Minn.) Creamery Association, protesting against the passage of the McKellar bill limiting the cold storage of butter to three months; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Association of Credit Men, favoring the passage of legislation for the prevention and control of floods by the Mississippi and other rivers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the council of the city of Benton Harbor, Mich., and the Benton Harbor Development Co., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of Texas Staats-Verband, representing 10,000 American citizens, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, Senate joint resolution 88, and Senate joint resolution 50; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of the Daughters of Liberty, Richmond Council, No. 143, Philadelphia; Robert Morris Council, No. 41, Order of Independent Americans, Germantown; Bellevue Council, No. 692, Order of Independent Americans, Philadelphia; the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia; Washington Camp, No. 764, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, Philadelphia; Francisville Council, No. 837, Order of Independent Americans, Philadelphia; Quaker City Commandery, No. 422, Ancient and Illustrious Order Knights of Malta, Philadelphia; John R. Marlin Council, No. 20, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Philadelphia; Washington Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Germantown; Washington Camp, No. 15, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, Philadelphia; Frankford Council, No. 176, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Frankford; Washington Camp, No. 304, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, Philadelphia; Washington Camp, No. 290, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, Philadelphia; Penns Park Council, No. 973, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Penns Park; Washington Camp, No. 478, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, Philadelphia; Daughters of Liberty, Council No. 36, Philadelphia; and State Council of Pennsylvania, Daughters of Liberty, Philadelphia, all of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Matthew Thornton Branch of the American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against appropriation of funds for the celebration of the "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania Cold Storage & Market Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring amendments to House bills 9266, 9530, and 9987; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of William P. King & Son, of Peach Bottom, Pa., protesting against the enactment of House bill 9832, relating to canned goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELVERING: Petition of Lyon Post, No. 9, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring passage of bills now pending in Congress for the relief of the survivors of the Military Telegraph Corps in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Civil War veterans, favoring passage of House bill 8605, to increase amounts paid to those soldiers who were maimed and crippled in Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, favoring the passage of a bill for the building of two battleships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of United Trades and Labor Council of Streator and sundry citizens of Streator, organized labor and citizens of Rockford, and citizens of De Kalb, all in the State of Illinois, favoring congressional investigation of the mining conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Kendall County Bar Association, of Kendall County, Ill., protesting against the reorganization of the United States judicial district of Illinois (H. R. 9573); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL: Memorial of the Utah State Federation of Labor and the Tullix District Miners' Union, Utah, calling for a congressional investigation of labor conditions in the strike districts in Michigan and Colorado; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Salt Lake Federation of Labor, favoring congressional investigation of the alleged fraudulent acquisition of mining lands in Michigan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Ryon Isbell, protesting against House bill 9113; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Zion's Savings Bank & Trust Co., protesting against an increase of the present limit of postal savings association; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Evidence to accompany bill for the relief of J. C. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Potter County, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 8814; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., favoring the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., favoring congressional investigation into the recent strikes in the State of Michigan and other States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of S. G. Burdick, favoring increase of pension for veterans of Civil War and remuneration for veterans who were held as prisoners of war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of veterans of Civil War, favoring passage of House bill 8605 to increase pensions paid to certain classes of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 1736, United Mine Workers of America, favoring a Federal investigation of the labor troubles in Colorado and Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Produce Exchange, opposing the passage of the McKellar cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the plastering craft throughout the city of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bill (H. R. 7771) to regulate plastering in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolutions of East Brady Branch of Socialist Party, Pennsylvania, requesting a Federal investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of National Association of Assistant Postmasters, requesting the enforcement of the civil-service law; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Memorial of State administrators of vocational education, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 5, authorizing the appointment of a commission to investigate need for national aid to vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Brainerd, Minn., protesting against passage of Senate bill 752, regulating the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of merchants of Downing, Novinger, Elmer, and Ethel, all in the State of Missouri, favoring an interstate tax on mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Local Union No. 35, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Hartford, Conn., favoring a congressional investigation of the strike situation in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the George Washington Branch of the American Continental League of Connecticut, of Danbury, Conn., protesting against appropriating any money for the celebration of 100 years of peace among English-speaking peoples; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Connecticut Federation of Women's Clubs, to enact legislation for the Federal control of water powers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of J. H. Hale, of Glastonbury, Conn., protesting against including apples in the McKellar cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Socialist Party of Hartford, Conn., protesting against restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Memorial of the members of the miners' unions of Negaunee, Mich.; 2,000 citizens of Duluth, Minn.; Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y.; Menominee Socialist Local, of Menominee, Mich.; Scandinavian Local, of Negaunee, Mich.; the Women's Trade Union League of New York City; the Keweenaw Miners' Union, of Ahmeek, Mich.; Cigarworkers' Union of Houghton, Mich.; citizens of Greenland Township and vicinity, Mich.; and Socialist Local of Gladstone, Mich., favoring congressional investigation of the strike in the upper peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of certain citizens of Knox County, Me., and Lewiston, Me., opposing the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolutions by Socialist Party of Lewiston, Auburn, and Wiscasset, Me., advocating Government ownership of copper mines and congressional investigation of the strike conditions in Michigan and elsewhere; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Waterville, Me., approving the plans of the park commission for the beautification of Washington City; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of A. H. Babcock and other citizens of Albion, Wis., protesting against the passage of the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of citizens of Rhode Island, favoring a two-battleship program at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of citizens of Pike County, Pa., urging the passage of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring the creating of a reserve strength in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Knights of Luther, Omaha, Nebr., favoring House bill 6060, the Burnett illiteracy test bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Woman's Synodical Society of Home Missions of California, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of San Francisco Camp, No. 4, National Indian War Veterans, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 1672, to place on the pension rolls the survivors of the early Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolutions of postmasters' organizations and citizens of California, opposing the elimination of assistant postmasters from the classified service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions by the Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring improvements at the Crescent City Harbor, Crescent City, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the California State Federation of Labor, San Francisco Labor Council, and other organizations in California, favoring the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, favoring passage of Senate joint resolution No. 5, authorizing the appointment of a commission to investigate need for national aid to vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Resolutions of Local Union, No. 171, Bakers' International Union, of New Haven, Conn.; Bookbinders' Local Union, No. 208, of Meriden, Conn.; and Local (New Haven) Socialist Party, requesting congressional investigation of Michigan copper-mine strike; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of Massachusetts Association of Sealers of Weights and Measures, favoring national legislation to the end that uniformity of weights and measures shall exist throughout the various States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolution of the Connecticut Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring legislation for Federal control of water powers on public domain and on navigable streams; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, telegrams from citizens of Connecticut, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of Kenton Lodge, No. 151, Brotherhood of Railroad Carmen of America, favoring an investigation of the mining districts of Michigan and other parts of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters, protesting against changing the assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Jersey City, Newark, and Flemington, N. J., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the publishers and editors of the Perth Amboy es Videke, of Middlesex, N. J., protesting against the literacy test in the Burnett-Dillingham bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the mayor and common council of the borough of Sea Bright, N. J., favoring an appropriation by Congress for protection of the peninsula upon which Sea Bright is located; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of Daughters of Liberty, of Buford and Jamesburg, N. J., favoring the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of the Cigar Makers' Union, No. 129, Denver, Colo., favoring the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon bills (H. R. 1873 and S. 927); to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Yuma, Colo., protesting against the passage of House bill 9974, relative to preventing labor on buildings in the District of Columbia on the Sabbath day; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Boulder Commercial Association, of Boulder, Colo., protesting against any further withdrawals of public lands or any curtailments of the rights of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Colorado, favoring congressional investigation of the mining conditions of Colorado and Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of the Idaho-Washington Development League and the Commercial Club of Lewiston, Idaho, favoring an appropriation for the continued improvement of the mouth of the Columbia River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, favoring the construction of a breakwater or harbor improvements for the northwestern part of California; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Woman's Synodical Society of Home Missions of California, favoring the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Stephen Jackson Post, No. 191, of Santa Maria, Cal., favoring passage of a bill for the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the California State Federation of Labor and the San Francisco Labor Council, favoring the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Mrs. E. Loch, of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, Senate joint resolution 88, and Senate joint resolution 50; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of the members of the Franklin Business Association relative to the retention by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad of their present Sound steamboat lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of citizens of Blanchard and Centerville, Iowa, favoring the enactment of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of the business men of Dryden, Elmira, Ithaca, Hornell, Newark Valley, Oswego, and Watkins, in the State of New York, advocating passage of House bill 5308, to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of business men of Trumansburg, Candor, and Groton, in the State of New York, favoring legislation to compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to

contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the State administrators of vocational education, favoring passage of Senate joint resolution 5, authorizing the appointment of a commission to investigate need for national aid to vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of the council of the city of Benton Harbor, Mich., and the Benton Harbor Development Co., protesting against passage of the La Follette seamen's bill without proper distinction between Great Lakes transportation and ocean transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the New York State Council of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring the passage of House bill 6060, being the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Elmira, N. Y., protesting against passage of Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Cigar Makers' Union No. 348, Corning, N. J., favoring a congressional investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Business Men's Association of Ithaca, N. Y., approving the plans of the park commission for the beautification of Washington City; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Waverly, N. Y., favoring a reasonable increase of freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring a law for the protection of foreign exhibitors at the Panama-Pacific Exposition against unauthorized copying or reproduction of their exhibits; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of various residents of Schenectady County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 6060, relating to the immigration of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State of New York, favoring the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relating to the sale of liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of local Socialist Party of Rotterdam Junction, N. Y., petitioning a congressional investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of the Socialist Party of Johnstown, N. Y., favoring a congressional investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York, favoring an amendment to House bill 6060, restricting classes of immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the administrators of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, favoring passage of Senate resolution 5, providing for a national commission on vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Curtis V. Livingston and 157 other citizens of Urbana, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Burnett bill to provide a literacy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of the Farmers' Institute of Guernsey County, Ohio, favoring the passage of the bill for the submission of an amendment to the Federal Constitution to the States for their ratification for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of citizens of Cheboygan, Mich., requesting that an appropriation be made for dredging Cheboygan River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 13, 1914.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3484) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, being chapter 231 of Thirty-sixth Statutes at Large.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1966) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved February 9, 1909.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1967) regulating the manufacture of smoking opium within the United States, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1966. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved February 9, 1909; and

H. R. 1967. An act regulating the manufacture of smoking opium within the United States, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented memorials of the Daniel H. Comber Club, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Danbury, Conn.; of the Vinegar Hill Club, of Philadelphia, Pa.; and of John Hancock Branch, American Continental League, of Lynn, Mass., remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the celebration of the so-called 100 years of peace among English-speaking peoples, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of persons who served in the United States Military Telegraph Corps during the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CUMMINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Treynor, Iowa, praying for the enactment of a national cooperative rural bank law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. NELSON presented resolutions adopted by Local Lodge No. 615, International Association of Machinists, of Proctor; of the Building Trades Council of Minneapolis; of Local Lodge No. 110, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of St. Paul; and of North Shore Lodge, No. 647, International Association of Machinists, of Two Harbors, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring the enactment of legislation to make lawful certain agreements between employers and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the St. Paul Association of Credit Men, of Minnesota, favoring appropriations for the completion of a system of levees along the Mississippi River for protection against floods, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the German American Alliance of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Workmen's Circle Branch, No. 266, of St. Paul, Minn., and a memorial of the City Central Committee of the Socialist Party of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Burnett immigration bill, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Conway Springs, Kans., praying for an investigation into the conditions existing in the mining districts in Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wichita, Nekoma, and Osborne County, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Asherville, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to further re-